

1862

Bellum Grammaticale :

OR, THE

Grammatical Battel Royal.

3 Feb

Brightland, Mattan
Belum Gernik
Pleasant

OF THE

Geographical Board Royal

~~K. Greenwood~~
Bellum Grammaticale:
OR, THE
Grammatical Battel Royal.³
IN
REFLECTIONS

On the Three

English Grammars,
Publish'd in about a Year last past.

In a LETTER to the learned and ingenious
Whilom Assistant to the learned Mr. Benjamin
Morland of Hackney.

With a POSTSCRIPT to Heterologus, Usher to
the learned Dr. Busby.

Grammatici certant Et adhuc sub Judice Lis est. Hor.

Irasci nostro non debes Cerdo Libello

Ars tua non Vita est, carmine lasa meo. Martial.

If any Gentleman will be pleas'd to make any Amendments
or Additions to this, they shall be gratefully acknowledg'd,
and inserted in their proper Place. Greenwood, Gram. &c.

ουουδ' ιτ ντ μακ' ουε στ' ανη

Θατ σαρμ μινυ ραναιε σ' ουδ' νερε χ' ανη,

Βυτ θατ θνη αλυεαιε δε α'δ' σαιε

Θε σελφ σαρμ θινυε θεσελφ σαρμ ουαιε.

L O N D O N, Printed for J. and M. Fermat, at the Sign of
the Priscian's Head; and are Sold by J. Morphew near
Stationers-hall. 1717. Price 6 d.

A

WORD

TO THE

READER.

Courteous Reader,

THE Town having been so long teiz'd with Party Squabbles of political Whig and Tory, I did not know but that a new Sort of Warfare might be welcome; and that is betwixt Professors of Arts about their own Provinces. I have begun with the Fountain or Foundation of all Arts and Sciences, GRAMMAR, designing thence gradually to rise to Poetry, Rhetoric, and the like, to expose the Folly and Impudence of pedantical Pretenders, always assuring thee, that I will be as tender of Merit, as I will be severe on the arrogant Attempts of the Ignorant.

There has been lately a mighty Bent, in the Buyers of Books, to Grammatical Essays; and particularly those which treat of the Nature of our own Language;

A Word to the Reader.

guage; for which I congratulate the Genius of our Time. 'Tis a Sort of Promise of its being weary, or ashamed of that general Barbarism, which has spread through our Writers in all the politer Arts; and that we may hope, if Emperic do not intrude with their empty Pretences, in a few Years to see our Nation as polite, as brave.

In this Kind these last eleven or twelve Months have introduc'd two Authors: The one owns himself boldly a Pedant, nay, seems vain of the Honour; the other has been so prudent or modest to conceal his Name. The learned Mr. Greenwood, to whom I have directed the following Discourse, has been so furiously cunning to divide his Grammar into such Parts, as entirely exclude every one of his eight Parts of Speech; which shews a peculiar Address in this Author, in picking out such a Division, as never was made before; for without that happy Singularity, he could have never obtain'd this singular Advantage. 'Tis a new Mode of Writing, and perhaps may prevail; and 'tis good to make an Interest before-hand with a future Favourite: And this is one Reason why I have chosen to do my self the Honour of Writing to him in this Epistolary Manner.

Adieu.

GRAM.

GRAMMATICAL WARS:
Or, Some
REFLECTIONS

On the two
English Grammars
Lately Publish'd.

Learned Sir,

THE generous Invitation that you give all GENTLEMEN to send you *Amendments* to your *Grammar*, (which I have plac'd in the Front of my Book, in Justification of my Undertaking) has given me the Assurance of laying before you some few Remarks on the Peccadillo's of your Pen, and which your sagacious Penetration might well oversee, in a **Work** of so vast an Extent, and Consideration.

Opere in tanto fas est obrepere Somnum.

*In such a Work, so long, so odd,
It is no Wonder that you nod.*

NOUNS, PRONOUNS, VERBS, and PARTICIPLES, and their Equipage, are but drowsy Companions;

panions; and he must be a Man of much *Mercury*, who can keep his Eyes open long in their Conversation.

Your being sensible of this, I doubt not, was the Reason you call on your Friends to awake you, least your Nap should be of too unmeasurable a Length; and therefore I start out from the Number of your *learned Acquaintance*, to rouse you with some amicable Admonitions, which cannot be unwelcome to a Man of your *Candor*, and *humble Opinion* of your self, and your *own Performances*.

For, Sir, it is far from my Thoughts to suspect you guilty of so much Insincerity, in what you print, as to suppose you would be displeas'd with *Plain-dealing*; or, like an *over-weening Poet*, desire our *Censure*, when you only expect our *Flattery*; or like the *Italians*, take it as an unpardonable Affront, if we accept the Present of which you make so un-compell'd an Offer. Your apparent *Judgment*, *Learning*, and *Politeness*, which your Book every where discovers, the *clear Manner* of your *thinking*, evident in the *Perspicuity* of your *METHOD*; the Force of your Reason, so visible in the *Proofs* of all your *Opinions*, forbid such *vain Imaginations*. I am therefore fully satisfy'd, that I shall find all my *Remarks*, how *minute*, and inconsiderable soever, inserted in their *proper Places*, whenever you shall vouchsafe to visit the Town with the *next Edition* of your *profound* and *incomparable GRAMMAR*.

This, Sir, I confess is not the only Motive of this present Address, yet it is all that I shall presume to advance in the Entrance ~~into~~ the World should imagine I had any *selfish Design* to bribe your Judgment in Favour of my Performance, which is an Aim too mean for the *Nobleness* of my Design. It is confess'd indeed, that the *Critics* will say, that this is the *proper Place* for all of that *Nature*, which I have to add; but the former Reason, and my Ambition to imitate your *incomparable Method*, has prevail'd

with

with me to put that *last*, which ought, otherwise, to have been *first*.

I shall therefore fall immediately on the first Thing that presents it self to the Eye, in your WORK, and that is, the *Title-Page* ; which I presume was not call'd an *ESSAY* purely from your *MODESTY*, (tho' that be every where very conspicuous) No, Sir, I fancy you had another View ; which, tho' of Weight, lessens the Merit of the former. It is the Notion of many of the *Beaux Esprits*, that *METHOD* and *ORDER* are Things too formal, nay, incompatible with an *ESSAY* ; they allow it to be a Sort of *Pindaric Writing*, which leaps from Thought to Thought, quitting imperceptably the Subject, and returning to it by, as unperceiv'd, Degrees. It is true, *Montaign's* Authority in his Practice, goes a great Way with me, as well as the rest of the *Wits* ; (for such, Sir, you must allow me to be) yet, when Instruction in *Arts* and *Knowledge*, and not the pleasing Wandrings of a wanton Fancy, is the Business, I would not have you so fond of the Judgment of the *WITS*, because Mr. *LOCK* has call'd his admirable Discourse on the *HUMAN UNDERSTANDING*, an *Essay*, and yet is clear in his *Method*, as well as his *Reasoning* ; since he knew that *Confusion* could never be the Mother of Instruction ; which was his Aim in that Book, as it ought to have been yours in this.

But tho' we may blame your *Modesty* (an uncommon, and very excuseable Fault in a young Author) in the *Beginning* of your Title, yet the rest makes us amends for that *Pudor Subrusticus*, that rural Bashfulness of the first Word. As for the Words *Practical Grammar*, I shall have Occasion to speak with them again before I have done, and shall therefore shake Hands with them for a while. *Describing the GENIUS and NATURE of the ENGLISH TONGUE*. This Part of your Title I can't pass over, without asking you one Question for Information Sake only. What is the Difference between *Genius* and *Nature* ? *Festus* derives *Genius* a *Gignendo*, from begetting, and it is
us'd

us'd by the best Authors in the same Sense as *Nature*. 'Tis true indeed it has another Sense, and a *Devilish* one, I mean, that of a *Demon*; but that, I presume, you would by no Means have suppos'd to be yours in this Place, lest your *Enemies* should take it in the *evil*, not *good* Sense; which would be too injurious to your Merit, for such a Friend as I am to approve. But be this as it will, it seems a bold Promise of an ESSAY to describe the *Genius* and *Nature* of a Tongue, that has been so little enquir'd into by the rest of your Country-men. I beg the Favour of you to insert in your next, where about in your Book you have given us this *rational* and *plain Account* of GRAMMAR in General, because it puzzles your Friends to silence your Enemies in this Particular.

I have no Fault to find with your *Motto*, but it is thought you might have added *Nosce te ipsum*, *Know thy self*, because it was written, as old Story tells us, on the Gates of *Apollo's* Temple, the *Fane* of *Wisdom* and *Knowledge*, of which your *Grammar* is the Foundation.

Of the *Epistle Dedicatory*, nothing can be said, but that you shew'd your Judgment in the Choice of a *Patron*, whose Learning and Merits, every Man allows; and if all your Performance had discover'd an equal Discernment, you had sav'd me the Labour of this Epistle.

The very Entrance of your *Fabrick*, shews the Architect very particular; yet a great Genius has always something singular. *Padre Pozzo*, in his Treatise of *Perspective* in *Architecture*, having describ'd the several Orders, which had adorn'd *Antiquity*, and employ'd the Study of the *Moderns*, frames a *new Order* different from the five, and calls it *Capricioso*, the *capricious Order*. You observing, that other Authors generally had one *Preface* before their Works, resolv'd to out-do them, and give us two before yours; and therefore one certainly, to fix the Method, should be call'd the *capricious Preface*; but which of them I leave

leave to you to determine; the Claim of both seeming so equal. Whether the JESUITS *new Model* was ever reduc'd to Practice, or not, or lives only in his Books, like many *modern Improvements* of the Ancients, I know not; and whether your Example will prevail, I cannot foretell; you have *Probability* on your Side. The Genius of the Age enclines mightily to *Novelties*; and the more odd and absurd, the more likely to please. Nay, I know not but your Example may make the next Writer of *Grammar*, give three Prefaces, the next four, and so on, till we have all Preface, and no Book.

All that I shall take Notice of in the first, will fall under my Reflections on the second; which I find to be that of Dr. Wallis, before his *Grammar*; from whence, I find your *Antagonist*, or *Antagonists*, (for I know not whether the former *Grammar* were written by one, or more) has, or have taken all that related to the Subject. For tho' Dr. Wallis was pleas'd to go a little out of the Way, is there a Necessity that every one else should follow him? What has the *Gaulish* and *Welsh* to do with the History of the *English Tongue*, which only was the Subject of his *Grammar*? And when he wrote to the Descendants of those Heroes, who brought in this Tongue with their Empire, it was very odd to call it a *Foreign Language*, unless the Author were a *Welsh-man*. Tho' this be the *Doctor's* Error, yet, by your translating his Preface, nay, by adding more where we had too much already, you only are answerable for it; and in your next, put a *Dele* not only to this, but to all your Additions. For the 2d Addition, it is entirely from the Purpose; what have we to do with the *imaginary* times of the *Gauls* in *Asia*, and of their Names? Does it give any Illustration to the History of our own native Language, or whose *Genius and Nature* alone, your Title promis'd us a Description. I know you may urge, that by this Means you join your Name with the *Doctor's*, and swell your Preface to a remarkable Bulk. That in-

deed is a noble Aim, and worthy your *Judgment and Labours*.

It is worth your while, when you write, to consider, that *Contradictions* are not the *principal Beauties of Style*; the *Figure* is too vulgar, and an Author, who has so many other wonderful Qualifications, may compleat his Character without it. Thus, when you had deny'd, in the first *Paragraph*, p. 8. that the *Welsh* could admit of a Mixture of the *Saxon*, by Reason of the perpetual Enmities betwixt them, kept up in some Measure to this Day; in the very next Paragraph, by a *Dexterity* peculiar to your self, you say, that the *Saxon* had admitted several *Welsh Words*, and the *Welsh*, several *Saxon*. Now, how this could be done, without some Manner of Mingling, you would be extreamly obliging to inform us in your next.

I find, when you are in at adding, you *seague* it away, (as Mr. *Bays* says) since the Addition, p. 10. is not of any great Weight: the Doctor having genteely and sufficiently, in a few Words, lash'd the corrupt Affectation of *Gallicising*. Now, there is a Maxim which will be of great Use to you, *Frustra sit per pluram quod possit fieri per pauciora*; Few Words are best. This made a malicious Rogue, who overlook'd me, whilst I was perusing this learn'd Preface, say, that you had put your Printer to a needless Trouble of inverted *Comma's*, since you had been so honest to the Doctor, as to leave as sufficient Marks of Distinction betwixt yours and his, as a Patch of *Linsey-Woolsey* on a Robe of Velvet, would be. This was an ill-natur'd *Witticism*, I confess, because you had not incorporated your Piece with such Connexion, as might disguise the Addition, like some artful Plagiaries. I told him, that you had always more candid Intentions, than to palm any Thing of yours on other Men; on the contrary, that you would be more humbly content to own any Thing of theirs, as your own natural *Issue*.

Well, but we may well allow ten Pages in such a Preface, to *Whim*, or *Excursions*, or what else you please

please to call them; I think 'tis enough, that Page 11. you come to the Matter, the *present English Tongue*. *Good Breeding* is commendable in all Men, but more so in an *Author*, nay, in a *young Author*; and to give Place to our Neighbours, is certainly good *Breeding*. Sure after this, no Body can call this an inhospitable Coast. But hold, I find we are not to enjoy our selves too long without Interruption. Here comes MOTHER TONGUES in, to make the Preface all of a Piece. There must be *Digressions*, and the farther from the Point, the more worthy of the Name. What would a Digression signify, unless a Man went a great Way out of the Road? Without this Liberty, one had as good keep close to the Matter.

Well, and here comes another *Figure of Contradiction*. You tell us, that MOTHER TONGUES have no *Affinity* to each other, and that the Branches or Issue, have *some Affinity* or Relation to their *Mother*, p. 12. and at the same Time assure us, that *Latin* is a Mother Tongue distinct, and different from the *Greek*: Yet I am confident, *Sir*, that you will not pass it upon us, that there is NO *Affinity* between the *Latin* and the *Greek*, because you know *Horace* would allow no Words naturally and by Right, to be introduc'd into the *Roman* Language, but such as were begot by *Greek* Sires. And this Maxim was so general, that we find too many of *Greek* Extract, to deny any *Affinity* between them: Nay, in the very next Page (13.) you are so generous to own, that much of it is a Derivation from the *Greek*, and tells us from *Crinitus*, that it had four several Dialects. So that, *Sir*, you might certainly have gone a Step higher, and made *Grandmother Tongues* likewise; since 'tis plain that the *Daughter Tongues* have several Dialects, in all Countries of any tolerable Extent; a *West Country*-man here in *England*, and a *North Country*-man, can scarce understand one another; at least, there is as evident a Difference, as between the *Greek* Dialects. And indeed you are too gracious and condescending, not to grant this in the very next Page 14. tho' you run the Ha-

zard of incurring a *Contradiction* of your *Characteristic* of MOTHER TONGUES.

But, Page 15, you are pleas'd to knock down all your allow'd MOTHER TONGUES at once, making them all Children of the *Northern Scythian*. So much can the unbounded Power of *curious critical Learning* perform! You have led us a Dance half round the Globe, in Pursuit of *Mother Tongues*; in Chace of *Curiosities* of great Use and Importance; have fix'd the *distinguishing Marks* of MOTHER and DAUGHTER Tongues; and when you had perswaded us, that we were possess'd of immense Riches, in a Moment the *Fairy Treasure* slips away, and you doubt of the *Legitimacy* of every one of them, and scarce allow us any *Mother Tongue* at all. Well, Sir, these are *hard Tryals*; but what we must undergo, I find, if we will traffic with you.

I confess indeed the *Enquiry* is as trifling and useless, as foreign to the Point; and the Distinction seems much of a Weight with that of a *Language* and a *Speech*, and which yet I have heard a *Pedagogue* as zealous for, as for his *Altars* and *Pycrust*. But, dear Sir, when you had made us hope for some *Mother Tongues*; had set them up, and given them a glorious Progeny, on a Sudden you grow so much their Foe, that the Reasons you bring against the *Matronality* of the *Asiatic Tongues*, looks something whimsical, viz. because some of the *radical Words* are something alike in many of them. Yet, Sir, why should this rob the *Asiatic Tongues* of this Honour, when much more did not deprive the *Roman* of it? But 'tis an old and true Saying, *One Man may better steal a Horse, than another look over the Hedge*. While Men are Men, there will be Favour and Affection, and then *Partiality* will ensue. Because *Latin* is your Acquaintance, and has done you some good Turns, you are resolv'd to sacrifice all Considerations to her Service. Why, *Gratitude* is a valuable Quality, I confess, tho' exerted only to a dead Language: But, Sir, by the Rule that you cast out the *Asiatic Languages* from

from MOTHERSHIP, we may, nay, some have pretended to prove a *Consanguinity* between the Languages of some of the *Americans*, and the *Jews*, and *Welsh*. But these are mere *dogmatic* Conjectures, and might do well enough in so *nominal* a Critic, as *Scaliger*, or some *Dutch* Commentators: But to you, Sir, who soar so high above them, they are no Ways agreeable; and a Person that can employ his Time so well in the *History* of the *Changes* of our Tongue, as your judicious Collection shews you can, ought not to descend to *Trifles*.

I shan't dwell much longer on your *long* Preface, only take Notice of an Indecency which you are guilty of. Page 27, 28. you fall into a Sort of Passion call'd *Indignation*, that any one should doubt, that a Child of five or six, or, *you are sure*, seven or eight, should not understand the *Latin Terms*, which you are pleas'd to make Use of in your *Grammar*; and call it throwing a SLUR upon *human Understanding* and *Art*. I beg you, Sir, never give Way to *Choler*; it is the most unbecoming Thing in the World to the *Face*; besides, one Grain of Reason is of a 1000 times the Force of a 1000 Pound of Passion: And truly I cannot persuade People to believe your *bare* Assertion in this Point, without any other Reason, but your Knowledge of Childrens *loving to be ask'd Questions*. This is the more remarkable in you, because you have chose to call AUXILIARY VERBS, *Help-Verbs*, which does not run near so well, as the former.

I cannot omit one Thing, which calls your *Sincerity* in Question on this Head; but I rather impute it to your Zeal for the *old Terms*; for Zeal makes every one blind. Thus, when you were translating the Doctor's Preface, you gave him a Turn against *new Terms*, when he was confessing, that *old* were not so proper for our Language. *Recepta* (says he) *tamen Artis Vocabula, quanquam Lingua nostra non usquequaque accommodata, retinenda censui*. Now, how *Usquequaque* comes to signify, *They may not all of them,*
in

in every Respect, I cannot imagine. In short, the Doctor plainly condemns the *Latin Terms*, and only made Use of them, because he would not innovate: And to have us'd *our English Terms* in *Latin*, would have been unintelligible to his *Latin* foreign Reader.

But of this I shall have Occasion to take more Notice in my Remarks on the Book it self, to which we now arrive, without stopping at such Trifles as false, or improper *English*.

The first fair Prospect that salutes my Eye, is something admirably good, for it is out of Mr. *Lock*; I mean, Sir, the Beginning of your *Introduction*; and many of your Friends wish, that you had made Use of more of his Words; for your Judgment was truly just, in liking them better, than your own. But the next Page gives us a *Discovery*, of which it would be barbarous to rob you of the Honour: I mean, a Sort of *articulate Words*, that have no Meaning. I had heard of *Cant-Words*, both of *Gypsies* and *Goals*; but then those were Representers of those Peoples Thoughts who understood them, which was as much as the best *Greek* and *Latin* Words could pretend to. But Words that signify'd *nothing*; (that is admirable, I Faith) I swear I thought there had been no such Thing in Nature, as contrary to the very Definition of a *Word*. I had always entertain'd an Opinion, that whatever Sounds had no *Idea* annex'd to them, could with no Manner of Propriety of Speech be call'd Words at all. You know the Maxim, *Fas est ab hoste duci*, and your *Antagonist's Grammar* might have better inform'd you of the *Nature* of Words; but the Malicious say you frequently reject *Truth* and *Sense*, only because they happen to be found in his Book. But let us hear;

Procul, procul este profani.

Keep off, keep off, Profane, nor bear

Words no Way fit for *Vulgar* Ear.

Scindapsus, Blictri, Lirum, Larum, Scirelum, Scraulum,
Here

Here is indeed a Discovery, that I believe you may enjoy without a Rival, because I cannot find out what can be drawn from it, either for the *In-struction* of YOUTH, or *Entertainment* of the LEARN-ED. Yet, after all, my good Friend *Scindapsus*, I cannot, for my Life, help thinking, that you have met with something of this *somewhere* or *other*, in some antiquated Method; in some old musty *Logic*, or some wise Treatise now wholly unknown: Such Things are done sometimes by such learned Authors. Be so fair in your next, to let us know where this notable Whim was originally form'd. This I must tell you, that tho' they had *no* Meaning, *no* Idea annex'd to them before, they will never be heard or read again, I dare believe, but they will be chang'd into real Words, by being inseparable from the *Idea* of a certain ingenious, facetious Person, that has a troublesome Sort of a Disease, call'd *Scribendi Cacoethes*. We shall think *Screlum*, *Scralum*, to be scribbling; and thus, in fine, Sir, you must be forc'd to rack your teeming Pate, to produce some other Words which signify nothing; and some People are apt to fancy you have a strange *Alacrity* that Way.

But to be serious; for Page 34 we begin to come to the Point. *Scindapsus*, *Lirum*, *Larum*, and their Brother Conjurers, have dissipated the Cloud, that has made us wander all this while. Chap. 1. begins with the Definition of *Grammar*; and this must be said for it, 'tis short, and so far very good, since, as *Hudibras* observes,

— *Brevity is very good,
Both when we ate, or are not understood.*
Grammar is the Art of speaking RIGHTLY.

I was something offended at the *Expletive*, *rightly*; but I soon found, when you sum'm'd up the Evidence of this Chapter, you agree, that the Word *rightly* is at least superfluous, and might have been left out of the *Definition*. Did you really think so,
when

when you wrote the *Definition*? Why then did you print what, in your own Opinion, was redundant? If you did not think so before you came to the End of the Chapter, it argues you guilty of writing without thinking, or soon changing your Opinion in Things of that Consequence, as the Words of a Definition ought to be: Or perhaps you did it, to have the Pleasure of telling us, that you had been impertinent. But, my dear *Ricci*, besides the being superfluous, it is obscure, and the very Word that the learned Mr. *Johnson* has with so much Reason condemn'd in his *Grammatical Commentaries*. I will not press too hard upon one particular Line, when every one affords so large a Scope for our Contemplations. For what can be more worthy Notice, than your Note upon this very Definition, when you tell us, that you have left out the *Art of Writing*, because it is an ACCIDENT of Speech; and none but the ESSENTIAL and CHIEF Things ought to be put into the Definition? But, dear Sir, your good Friend and Acquaintance *Vossius*, and before him *Aristotle*, with whom Reason agrees, say, that the End of any Art is not only the essential or chief Thing in any Art, but ought to be the Measures of its Definition. Now, certainly the END of Grammar is to express our Thoughts in Words join'd together in Sentences, according to the USE and PROPRIETY of every Tongue, either in SPEAKING or WRITING. This Definition, which I find in the other *English Grammar*, and which agrees with Mr. *Johnson's*, much nearer than yours, is plainly prov'd from the Notes; from whence, and from Mr. *Lock* too, it is evident, that Writing is the principal, if not the only End of Grammar; for Experience shows us, that all the Business of the World is done without minding the Soleisms, in which it is dispatch'd; but any Faults of that Kind in Writing, are infamous and obvious. Writing is another Manner of Discoursing; 'tis talking with the Absent, and the only Place where the Want of the Rules of Grammar is most seen, and where the

Know-

Knowledge of them is most requir'd, nay, absolutely necessary. But, Sir, if you had but remember'd what you your self said in your *first* Preface, you would never have made this Note. There you perfectly agree with me, and say, that *Grammar* is chiefly, if not only necessary for *Writing*. But let us hear your own Words. *It is indeed possible that a young GENTLEMAN, or LADY, may be enabl'd to speak pretty well upon some Subjects, and entertain la Visiter with DISCOURSE, that may be agreeable enough; yet I do not see how they should WRITE any Thing, with a TOLERABLE CORRECTNESS, unless they have some Taste of GRAMMAR; or express themselves clearly, and deliver their Thoughts by Letter, or otherwise, so as not to lay themselves open to the Censure of their Friends, for their blameable SPELLING, or false SYNTAX.* And thus we agree not only with one another, but with your *Antagonist* in his first Notes, when he says, *A certain Author seems defective, when he says GRAMMAR is the Art of SPEAKING, since it is plain, that a Mastery of it is of more Consequence in WRITING; the Solecisms of vulgar Discourse passing unheeded, tho' they would be monstrous in WRITING.* Now, some Men would have been so scrupulous, as to have confuted this Reason by some stronger, on which they might have built this Definition which is now so justly exceptionable and defective, since it imports, *that it is no Matter how we write, provided we speak correctly.* But since your Preface gives it of my Side, I suppose that was last written; and therefore we may shake Hands, we are both of one Opinion, and your Definition shall be mended next Time; nay, I am sure, that you will no where have Occasion to be angry with my Remarks; for I generally have your own Words to back my Censure, than which surely nothing can be more fair and equal. There is an odd Expression, or Words in this Passage, which I have quoted, and that is, *by Letter, or otherwise*, you had mention'd *Speaking* before; and therefore I suppose *otherwise* here is only an *Expletive*, and might be put

C

into

into your Chapter on that Subject, pag. 167. which you tell us *contribute nothing to the Syntax or Construction, nor the Sense of the Discourse; and yet give a greater Force and Emphasis to the Expression.* So that an Expletive is a Word that signifies nothing, yet gives a Force to Expression, such as *Bullies Oaths.* I swear you have a profound Penetration! I have all along been such a Coxcomb to think, that nothing could be emphatical, that did not contribute to the Sense; and in this Error should certainly have dy'd, had not I met with your learned *Grammar.* This makes me suppose, that your Friends *Scindaspus, Rictri, &c.* stand Candidates to be admitted into the Number of *Expletives*, at the next Vacancy. But your *Favourite Figure of Speech*, call'd *Nonsense*, I will pass over, lest my Reflections should fill a Volume bigger than your Book.

You next distinguish *Grammar* into *natural*, or *general*, and *instituted*, or *particular*: The first Part of this Distinction is near all we find in your Grammar of the *rational Grounds* you promise in your Title; except now and then a little Hint, which will require some Application to find out and connect; whereas your *Antagonist* has from Mr. *Arnaud*, the *Messieurs* of *Port-Royal*, &c. given us the whole *Rationale* of the Thing. He indeed not only gives us the great Names, but the Matter they deliver'd; but you, Sir, according to that *Self-sufficiency* which you every where discover, talk of *Bishop Wilkins*, *Dr. Hicks*, &c. but we must take your Word for their Merit, or dive into their Works. You tell us indeed, that *Dr. Wallis* justly finds Fault with our *English Grammarians*, where he says all of them, forcing our *English Tongue* too much to the *Latin Method*, have deliver'd many *useless* Precepts concerning *CASES*, &c. But why then, my dear Friend, did not you avoid Faults, that by his Means you discover'd in others? Why have you obtruded on us the *Genetive Case*, which that very Doctor rejected; brought us to a Necessity of a Case, which will not hold thro' our Language,
since

since, if we admit it, it will not go farther, than *Nouns*, which signify *Possession* ; but of this when we come to that Chapter.

The next Thing you come to, very justly is your *Division* ; for you divide *Grammar* into four Parts, *viz.*

Orthography,
Prosody,

|

Etymology,
Syntax,

'Tis true, that your *Antagonist* has in his Notes mention'd a *Division of Grammar*, something like this, and rejected it ; and for that Reason, I suppose, you chose it, that you might not be thought to follow him. But then, Sir, in my humble Opinion, you ought to have condescended so far to the common Sense of Mankind, as to have given us some Reasons for your preferring these hard Words, to those which need no Manner of *Explanation* ; for who is there, that can read, that does not know what *Letters, Syllables, Words, and Sentences* mean ? because we vulgar Creatures can discover none, unless it be the *Lechery* of expounding them in your Notes.

Well, you divide *Grammar* into four Parts : I suppose you mean essential Parts ; that is, Parts that must be taught, if you would teach the whole Art of *Grammar* : For certainly you was so scrupulous to admit nothing into the *Definition*, that has not *essential* and *chief*, will not put into your *Division* any Thing, that is not so. Upon this Supposition, we might reasonably suppose, that we should find something said of this in the Order, in which you have set them down ; or at least at some Time or other, when and where you should think fit. Let us therefore see your Conduct in this Particular. *Orthography*, in your *Division*, you justly place *first* ; but in your *Book*, you throw it into the *last* Place ; and there you tell us, that you treat of it much against your Will too. How ! dear Sir, against your Will treat of one Part of that *very same Division*, which your Judgment has made ? This is very odd to us poor Mortals ; but since *Orthography* fares better than *Prosody*, which you have made

another Part of your *Division*; she may be contented; for poor *Prosody* cannot get one Word to be said of her. You have indeed been very large on *Etymology*, which is much more proper for a *Dictionary*; and *Syntax* has the good Luck to have a few Pages bestow'd upon it. I vow I would not be *hypercritical*, yet I cannot pass over this *Division*, without this Remark that it is so unlucky as to leave out entirely one half of your Book, and that is the first Part of Words; of which you treat at large, without allowing them any Part in your *Division*. The Nature of *Nouns*, *Pronouns*, *Verbs*, *Participles*, &c. their Sub-divisions, &c. cannot come under *Orthography*, for that is only employ'd about SPELLING; that is, *Letters* and *Syllables*. They cannot come under *Prosody*; for the Business of that Part is to instruct us in the *Quantities* of *Syllables* and *Words*. They cannot be rang'd under the Head of *Etymology*; for that only regards the *Derivation* of Words from our own or foreign Tongues; besides, you have your self plac'd them under that Head. *Syntax* teaches the Construction of those Words, whose Nature, Distinction, and Property, you are suppos'd to know before-hand. So that it is evident, that your *Division* is extremely imperfect, when it leaves the Subject of half your *Grammar* entirely out. This, Sir, I am afraid is a very *fundamental* Error, and cannot well be inserted, unless you alter your whole Frame, and make a new *Division* of the Parts of *Grammar*. Permit me to recommend a plain and easy Pattern. What tho' it be your *Antagonist*, if you can improve by him, faith never be so opposite to your own Interest, to reject it. His *Division* perfectly takes in his whole Subject, and under every Head each is handl'd with a tolerable Perspicuity and Plainness; whereas your Method, by its *Confusion*, can never instruct.

Before I proceed to the next Chapter, I beg Leave, for Information Sake, to ask you a few Questions, hoping that you, as well as the many Children you have known at HACKNEY, will count it a Complement paid to your Understanding, to be ask'd the Meaning of Things.

I, therefore, presume to ask, whether this your *Grammatical Essay* be intended for the *Children* or *Learners*? for the *Masters* or *Teachers*? or only as an *Amusement* of the curious *Enquirers*? If for the *Children*, whether you would have them get what is the *Text*, or longer *Letter* without *Book*? or that, and the *Notes* too? If only the *Text*, then they burden their *Memories* with *hard Words*, of which they can understand nothing without knowing *Greek*. If they must get the *Notes* likewise, how could you imagine that it would not be an insupportable *Burden* to their young *Memories*, to learn two *Pages* in a small *Letter*, to explain *two Lines* and *four Words*? I speak this of this *Chapter* precisely, but in some *Measure* it will hold of all. I desire you to consider, whether the *Child* would not with more *Ease*, and to the greater *Advantage* of his *Understanding*, have got *Letters*, *Syllables*, *Words*, and *Sentences*, which need no *Manner* of *Explanation*?

Next, if they must get your *Notes* likewise without *Book*, to what *Purpose* are your *Questions*? Which only repeat what you have said before sometimes in other *Words*, sometimes in the same; and load the *Memory* with the *Questions*, as well as *Answers*; for then the *Child* must get by *Heart* almost five *Pages* in a small *Letter*, to retain and understand three *Lines*: *An admirable Way of easy and speedy Teaching!*

But perhaps these ingenious and learned *Notes* are for the *Instruction* of the *Teacher*. But then you must suppose him very ignorant, and very unfit for the *Business*; and at the same *Time* you give him the *easy Task*, and the *Child* the more *difficult*. Well, but dear Sir, when your *Hand* was in at *Question* and *Answer*, why did you not go on with them? What stopt you where you end? I mean, what *Reason* or *Consideration* could stop you? For when you had ask'd, what is *Latin*? (which, by the *Way*, was nothing to your present *Business*) and answer'd, *A Language that the People call'd Romans, spoke*; why did you not ask again, what is *Greek*? and answer, *A Language which the People call'd Greeks, spoke*? And so on to *Arabic*, and
all

all the Tongues of the Universe ? The *Reason* is as strong for one, as the other, and the *Instruction* of as much Use to the Learner. But indeed I must tell you, my good Friend, you have discover'd, before now, a strange Partiality for the *Latin*, which is not prudently done ; for that being known, will destroy your Aim and End, and so poor *Latin* get nothing by all your Zeal.

But if you were resolv'd to go no farther, than *Latin* ; if that Sort of a MOTHER TONGUE, was your *non plus Ultra*, why did you not, for Illustration of the Matter, go on, and ask who the *Romans* were ? and answer, People that inhabited Part of *Italy*, and conquer'd the World ? What Part of *Italy* ? A. A City call'd *Rome*, from whence they had their Name. Where was that City ? A. Situate, lying or being near the Place where *Rome* stands at this Day. And then, for fear the Child should still be in the dark, *question*, and *answer* it, 'till you had made a full Description of the City, which would have given you Occasion of some learned Notes out of *Lipsius*, *Rosinus*, *Gravius*, &c. as well as that upon the *Circus*, p. 37. nay, you might have proceeded to the *Clime* and *Latitude*, nay, and the *Road* thither, all as edifying, and more instructive, than the Question you ask'd ; which I humbly conceive has nothing to do with the *English* Language, or *Grammar*, in which you are here instructing your Learner ; and therefore you ought not to have introduc'd any Thing foreign, to confound him with Things impertinent to his Lesson.

I cannot yet dismiss this Chapter, without another Question ; and that is, To what Purpose is that long Translation of *Quintilian* ? Since you might have told us in a very few Words, *That Custom is the Use of the best Speakers, and not of the Mob*. Now, a long Quotation for a visible and obvious Truth, is what we generally call *Pedantry* ; but in you, Sir, to be sure, 'tis the Effect of *Modesty*, to give us an Authority for what we say, as if *Reason* from YOU were insufficient.

I cannot omit one Objection to your Way of *Question* and *Answer*, because it was made by a peculiar Admirer of your eminent Parts; which is this, that their Business is only *actum agere*, to tell us what we knew before; I mean, what you have told us already; and that your *Questions*, of this Chapter, may, with Plainness and Perspicuity, be brought into less than eight Lines, which now extend to three Pages, Nay, some accuse you of being an Emulator of *Mac Flacno*, that great Master of *Tautology*. 'Tis true indeed, if that be a Beauty of dedactic Writing, few can pretend to be your equal.

It has been the Opinion of most Men of Judgment, that the fewest Rules were best, provided they were expressive, and free from Obscurity. Now, this whole first Chapter is spent in defining and dividing *Grammar*. The first is dispatch'd in one Line, and the second in four Words; which are explain'd unintelligibly to any common Capacity; and in five Pages in a small Letter, contains nothing new.

Your *Antagonist* allows not above ten plain easy Lines to all this: But he is guilty of the same Fault, under which you labour; and that is, that neither of you sufficiently distinguish what the Child is to get by Heart, what not. He has indeed corrected this Error in the second Edition, by putting those into expressive Verse; which at once helps the Memory, and gives a Pleasure to the Learner.

But before we go to the next Chapter, I must remark, that having given us your four Parts of *Grammar*, expected that you would, as *Method* requir'd, have given the Title of your first Part *Orthography*, and under that Head have deliver'd the Doctrine, which it is its Duty to teach. But alas! inconsistent with your self, you have no sooner fix'd the Parts or Divisions of *Grammar*, but you throw 'em all aside, and detain us half your Book with the *Parts of Speech*, which you had assign'd to no Head at all. But, Sir, you did not consider the Consequence of this Procedure; for it certainly justifies the Division of your *Antagonist*, by being forc'd to treat
of

of Words by themselves, with this Difference: HE places them under one Head of his Division of *Grammar*, YOU under *none*. And indeed you seem sick of your Division, as soon as you have made it; and so much for the first Chapter.

What I have said of the *first* Chapter, will in some Measure hold good of all the others; for what, I suppose you mean for *Rules*, are never the tenth Part of the Chapter, tho' they require all the rest to explain them; and this must needs be a very *plain* and *easy* Way of Instruction, as well as an irrefragable Proof of the Advantage of retaining the old *Latin* Terms. In the *second* Chapter you stand to your *Pan-Puddings*, *Lily's* *eight* Parts of Speech, and describe them much in as easy Words; tho' Mr. *Johnson* in his *Grammatical Commentaries*, has confuted this Division, and your *Antagonist* had done the same, yet you keep the old exploded Track, without giving any one Reason for it; nor could you indeed produce any other, than what the *Wild Irish* did for their Horses drawing with their Tails, *viz.* Their Grand-fathers did so. Mr. *Lane*, in his *Key to the Art of Letters*, reduces the Parts of Speech to four, and the *Messieurs* of *Port-Royal* have made it out beyond Controversy, that there are no more in the Nature of Language in *general*, than four Parts. But I shall have Occasion to go to the Bottom of this Controversy, after I have gone through the Body of your Book.

Tho' this Chapter be but short, it affords several Things worthy remarking. I first observe your laudable Care of *Perfpicuity*, and therefore you add a *Parenthesis*, (a wonderful Enlightner of Discourse) to make what you say, the more *clear*. Thus you say, *The GRAMMARIANS*, (*or they who write GRAMMAR.*) But you stop not here; your Care is farther extended, and your Answer to the first Question, is an extraordinary Thing in its Kind. Q. *What is Speech?* A. *Speaking, or Discourse.* This, in other Words, runs thus: Q. *What is Speech?* A. *Speech: An Elucidation worthy so great a Master of the DIDACTICS.* Another Care is conspicuous in you; and that is, of driving in what you

you say by Repetitions ; for in this Chapter you repeat the *eight* Parts of Speech no less than three times. But being giving Samples of your *Study* of making all Things clear, I must take Notice to this End, that there is one very pleasant Question here, *Are there no more than eight Words in a Language?* Besides this Consideration, that this *very* Question consists of ten Words, it is ask'd after another Question, which one would have thought might have prevented so *wise* a Demand, which is thus: *What do you mean by eight Parts of Speech?* A. *Eight SORTS of Words, which Men use in Speaking.* I confess this is not so clearly express'd as one would expect from you ; yet you plainly say, *Eight SORTS of Words, not eight Words.* I am afraid, dear Sir, that Questions like these no Child of *five* Years old could ask ; and therefore, that your placing them in your *Grammar.* is *throwing a SLUR on HUMAN UNDERSTANDING,* and an *AFFRONT to the ART ;* since by these *wise* Questions, we can suppose nothing less, than that you think you are teaching *mere Ideots.* And yet you go on ; for the next Question, is. *Why do they give different Names to the Parts of Speech?* A. *To distinguish one PART of Speech from another.* But for fear even this should not be plain enough, you explain it by a *Carpenter* and his Tools. This is no Complement, I am sure, to the *Childrens Understandings,* for which you were so zealous in the Preface, as to allow them the understanding *hard Terms* with a little Explanation ; whereas here you deny them the least Share of *common Sense.* For how could any Child be capable of saying there were *eight* Parts of Speech, need to be told, that they had not all the same Name ? For if they had, how could they be *eight several Parts?* Besides, the several Names of them had been already told ; and therefore the *Ideot,* that is suppos'd to be taught, could not want Information, that the several Names were given to distinguish them from one another.

But methinks you, Sir, who have here discover'd such Caution in conveying Knowledge with *particular Plainness,* should have chose a more familiar Explanation,

tion, than by a *Carpenter's Tools*; which perhaps few of your Children have either seen, or heard of. You might have said, Your *Baby, Miss*, is distinguish'd by Parts: Why don't you call her Petticoat, her Shoes, her Gown and Head-dress, all by the same Name? *A.* Because, *Miss*, they are different Things; and to call different Things by the same Name, would be to confound them; and all that, *Miss*. The Question that concludes this Chapter, would be thought very impertinent, in any Book, but *yours*; but you must be allow'd to make yours all of a Piece, and so the less to the Purpose of your Subject, the more to *yours*. *Q.* Are the Parts of Speech the same in English, as in Latin? I find *Latin* will still be uppermost in all you say or do; you have a strange Panchant for *Latin*, else the Question would have been more instructive, and more to the Purpose, if thus: *Q.* Are the Parts of Speech the same in English, as in all other Languages? Well, every one after their own Way.

In the next Chapter, we come to the Explanation of a Noun, in these Words: *A Noun is the NAME of a Thing, that may be perceiv'd either by the Sense or Understanding.* I vow, Sir, I think old *Lily* himself is more obvious to a Child's Understanding: *A Noun*, says he, is the NAME of a Thing, that may be seen, felt, heard, or understood. For here *Lily* comes to the particular Senses, whereas you, Sir, are too general. It may happen, that a Child cannot immediately enumerate the Senses, or know what they are; tho', at the same Time, he knows what he feels, sees, hears, &c. Give me Leave to say, Sir, that what you might have said, had been much plainer, and less difficult, viz. That the Meaning of the Word *Noun*, was *Name*; so that all Names of Things, were to be call'd *Nouns* by a Term of Art, of reverend Antiquity. There is another Misfortune attends this Definition; and that is, that you are oblig'd to have Recourse to your *Antagonist's Terms*, to explain your own; which is a downright Confession, that his is most plain, easy, and intelligible; and by Consequence, that you only go so far out of your Way, for the

the Sake of an old, odd, *foreign* Term, when you might have been better supply'd at *Home* : A Vice and Folly that you have been severe (I mean after your Manner) on in your Preface ; and yet build your own Book upon it, with this only Difference, you find Fault with our *Gallicising*, but practice a more culpable *Latinising*. How much *easier* had it been to have made Use of *Name*, and added this Mark, that before *Names* may be *a*, *an*, or *the*, and *Thing* cannot come after them. But this would be to follow the *Easiness* of your *Antagonist* ; a Crime you so abhor, that you would rather fly to *Obscurity*, to be unlike him. I confess I think his first Description of a *Name* something above the Apprehension of the general Capacity of Children ; yet it must be allow'd to be justly and easily express'd to any grown Person. But this Defect, I am inform'd, is alter'd in the second Edition. To expose the *Absurdity* of every Question, would be too *insupportable* a Fatigue, both to *me* and the *Reader* ; I shall therefore only pick out one now and then, that best pleases my *Capricio* ; only I must beg one Favour of you, that is, that you would not be pleas'd to pretend to teach *Grammar* by a perpetual Breach of your own Rules ; and this Desire being so much for your Advantage, I flatter my self, that you will have a *particular* Regard to it.

Your Explanation of the Words. *Noun*, *Substantive*, *Adjective*, &c. show your *peculiar Happiness* of speaking to the Capacity and Knowledge of a CHILD, where you explain *English*, or *Anglicis'd Terms*, by the *Latin Words* from whence they are deriv'd. How must a *Child's* Understanding and Knowledge be enlarg'd, by telling him, that *Adjective* is deriv'd from *Adjicere*, *Noun* from *Nomen*, *Substantive* from *Substantia*. In my humble Opinion, the Child would have been full as much inform'd of the Nature of these Words, if you had said, the *Adjective* comes from *Scindapsus*, *Noun* from *Blictri*, the *Substantive* from *Lirum*, *Larum*, *Scerelum*, *Scraulum* : For *Scindapsus* is as easy to a Child, as *adjicere*, and *Lirum*, *Larum*, as any of the rest ; they are all unknown Sounds, and must therefore be equally *obscure* and unin-

fructive to a *Child*, who knows nothing of *Latin*; for really I fancy, that Derivations from *Latin* Words should never be given to such, as know no more of that Tongue, but that *it was spoke by a People call'd ROMANS.*

Well, but I find you are gracious, extremely condescending, and begin to remit of that *Austerity*, which ty'd you so close to *old Terms.* For after you have oblig'd your Scholar to learn the *barbarous Term Noun* for two Chapters together, and taken such *laudable Pains* in giving a *learned Explanation* of it, you at last tell us *plainly*, that we may even throw it out of Doors, the Business will be done every Jot as well with *Substantive* and *Adjective.* But, dear Sir, do you do by your beloved TERMS, as some would have us do with *Cucumbers*, pare them, slice them, season them with Pepper, Oil, Vinegar, and Salt, and bestow some Pains to shake and drain them well, and then throw them out on the *Dung-kill*? Alas! this is *Operam, & Oleum perdere*, to lose both your *Pepper* and *Oil.* Nay, this brings a very disagreeable Imputation on your *Temper*, as if you were given to *change, fickle, inconstant*, and the like; female Perfections allow'd, but not quite so bright in a Man of Learning. For I protest you seem'd in earnest, as good a Friend to NOUN, as to any other Part of Speech; you smil'd on him, gave him the first Place, caress'd him, nay, hugg'd him close, and yet now by a strange sudden Whirl of Fancy, you kick him all at once out of Doors, as an *idle, superfluous Term.* So frail is all human Favour and Happiness! To Day we are on the topmost Spoke of Fortune's Wheel, all Eyes adoring us, all Tongues flatering us, and every Hand to help us; but to *Morrow* we are tumbl'd to the Bottom, and none so great a Scoundrel to say one good Word in our Behalf. Even thus has it far'd with poor NOUN! and indeed well it might; for if *Towns* and *Countries* fail, and are swept off the Face of the Earth by the Violence of Fortune and Time, why should any Word, how *stout*, how *considerable* soever, pretend

tend to a more constant and settl'd Fate ? Besides, *Horace* long ago has foretold their Doom.

*Ut sylva Foliis pronos mutantur in Annos
Prima cadunt : Ita Verborum vetus interit Aetas.
Debemur Morti, nos, nostraq; —
—— Mortalia Facta veribunt ;
Nedum Sermonum stet Honos, & Gratia Vivax.*

Turn'd thus by my Lord Roscommon.

*Words are like Leaves ; some wither ev'ry Year,
And ev'ry Year a younger Race succeeds.
Death is a Tribute all Things pay to Fate ;
Yet this, and they, and all will be forgot.
Why then should Words challenge Eternity,
When greatest Men, and greatest Actions die ?*

This is the most solid Comfort, that I can give to **NOUN** ; his Fate is common, he will not be long without Companions ; and, *Solamen miseris socios habuisse dolorum* ; The more the merrier. Nay, he may not want some of his own Rank and Dignity ; perhaps you may vouchsafe, now your Hand is in, to give him another Part of Speech, or two, before you have done. For why should your Parts of Speech fare better than your Parts of Grammar, two Parts of which you have rejected ? *Prosody* is referr'd to a Book in *Utopia*, and *Orthography* turn'd to your very Door, in order to be thrust out on the first Opportunity ; since you declare, p. 231. how *unwilling* you are to say one Word about her. Now, there are eight Parts of Speech ; so that if one should be thrown aside, there remains a jolly Company still ; nay, you are so far from reducing their Number, that by throwing out *Noun*, you got one more, and so make nine Parts of Speech ; since in the Place of *Noun*, you substitute *Substantive* and *Adjective*, visibly two distinct Parts of Speech, as is plain from Mr. *Johnson's* Commentaries.

But Railery apart ! Let me be serious again, if it be possible, in such Company ; for I vow, my Dear, there
is

is something extremely *risible* in your Conversation. For the very next Chapter restores NOUN again. — NOUNS are either proper or common. The Way of the World still ; here is NOUN restor'd to its Grandeur, and *Substantive* is rejected ; the Word *Noun*, which is common to both *Substantive* and *Adjective*, being us'd for the former : And this, to be sure, Sir, is done by the *Art of clear Speaking*, of avoiding *Obscurity*, of *puzzling* Children with Names of no fix'd Signification ; meaning now a *general*, and then a *particular*. I know you will plead *Prescription* ; that will not do, you were to improve, and avoid the Defects of others, however consecrated with the Stamp of Antiquity.

But hold, what have we here, in the Name of Wonder ? Of the ENGLISH PROPER NAMES ? *I am sensible*, say you, *that this Account of the ENGLISH PROPER NAMES, does not STRICTLY relate to the Subject of this Book.* Ah ! good Sir, I vow to Gad, you are too *nicely* scrupulous ! What ! make an Apology for putting in any Thing, that does not *strictly* belong to the Subject of your Book ? Oh ! by no Means. I protest, Sir, you have free Leave to say what you please, do what you please, nay, and *write* what you please : For if you can say any Thing *less* to the Purpose, than what you have already, without any *Manner of Excuse*, you are a Person of the best Address that Way, of any Person in *Christendom*. But, say you, *It does not STRICTLY relate to the Subject of this Book.* Why, my dear Friend, never mince the Matter ; speak out *boldly*, Man ; never fear, for it no more relates to the Subject of your Book, than a List of the *Czar of Muscovy's Fool-Guards* would have done. 'Tis a Complement to *John Chamberlain, Esq;* and fills up your Book ; and that's enough, I think ; for if it be but a *Book*, what signifies what is in it ? A Book's a Book, and a Spade's a Spade ; and if a Man writes a Book, why then he is an *Author*, and by Consequence has *Authority*, and Authority to say what he pleases in his *own Book*. All that I think you are defective in, in this Place, is, that you have not let us know whether we must get it *without Book*, or not ; but

but that, to be sure, you'll let us know in your next Impression. If I might be thought worthy of advising you, Sir, I would have you make a *Praxis* of your own *Grammar*, with it, and add that to the three you have already translated from Dr. Wallis; and that will convince the *Incredulous*, that you have some *Industry*, as well as *Knowledge* of what you write about; for I protest by these *Patches* of other Mens Works tack'd together with *Packthread*, the *Town* is at a Loss what to make of your *Industry* or *Skill*. However, I must own my self particularly oblig'd to you for this *Catalogue*, since I may slip over three Pages without Fear of omitting any Thing material. And so I come to the fifth Chapter, Thanks to my *uncommon* Patience, and that particular Value which I have for your Writings. And because I will not dwell on *Pecadillo's*, I will say nothing of this fifth Chapter. Yet I cannot pass over the *sixth*, without remarking, that notwithstanding all the Helps you have summon'd from Dr. Hicks, I must agree with Dr. Wallis, that the adding (*s*) or (*es*) to *Nouns* signifying *Possession*, they are *Adjectives* immediately deriv'd from *Substantives*: So that there is no need of endeavouring to thrust one Case into our Language, quite contrary to its *Genius*, which hates Cases, since the Way Dr. Wallis has judiciously chose, answers the End as well, and agrees better with the *Nature* of our Tongue; besides, if we admit this new *Genitive* of yours, it will only reach *Nouns* of *Possession*, (as I have said) which is another Mark of the Tongue's refusing it. As for Dr. Hicks's *Smith*, *Smithes*, *Smiche*, *Smithas*, *Smitha*, *Smithum*, it has no more to do with our present Language; than with *Greek* or *Hebrew*. But be this as it will, the Dispute is not worth maintaining; either Way will do the Business. If you will have a Maypole, you may have a Maypole; and since you will force upon the ENGLISH one Case out of *six*, with which it has nothing to do, why enjoy your *Liberality*; our Language is not one jot the richer for it, since it possesses no more by it, than it has without it.

The

The Discourse you give us about the *Genders*, is so little to the Purpose, that even *you* your self seem sensible of your Error in that Particular; but you are always like *Medea*, and with her say,

———— *Video meliora proboq;*
Deteriora sequor. ————

For, p. 57. you tell us, *Tho' what has been already said*, may be counted *unnecessary*, since the *English Tongue* has NO GENDERS; yet, *because it may gratify SOME Readers*, I will venture to add ANOTHER Observation. That is as much as to say, *Tho' you are sensible*, that what you have already said, is nothing to the Purpose of those, who would read your *Grammar*, as a *Grammar*, yet you will go farther yet out of your Way, to gratify *some* Reader or other, that may like any Thing that is not to the Purpose. Much good may it do the Heart of you, dear Sir, since you are sensible that you give us but little to the Purpose on the Head of *Grammar*, you will not let us want *various* and *sundry* DIGRESSIONS to amuse, and all that; and *Digressions* must be allow'd to be of considerable Use to an Author, who has but little to say to his *Subject*.

The *Questions* and *Answers* of this Chapter, are like the rest, a *needless*, *uninstructive* REPETITION. But here I find you are in a merry *Mood*; and good Faith, little SCRELUM SCRAULUM, if I catch you a *laughing*, I will laugh with you, if I can. But the Devil on't is, I find you *laughing* always where there is no Jest; and very serious, when all you say makes me laugh very heartily; tho' I confess, to hear the learned *Pedagogue* speaking *Latin* to his *English* QUERIST, is something upon the merry, and all that; and I find I shall not be long before I shall have my Turn of *laughing* too: For Chap. VII. is of *Articles*. *Articles!* Why what are those? *An Article*, reply you, is a Word before a SUBSTANTIVE, for the clear and more particular expressing of it, &c. How is an *Article* a Word? Then I suppose (for I dare not affirm any Thing) it
is

is a *Part of Speech*. Well, let me look back a little, and see whether I can find it among the *Eight*. No, not a Syllable of it! *Noun, Pronoun, Verb, Participle, Adverb, Conjunction, Preposition, and Interjection*; but no *Article*. Whence come you, good Sir *Article*? Who owns you? Every one excludes you! But if none of those *Articulate Words* (as you are pleas'd to call them, p. 34.) which denote or signify *some Person, or Thing*, will admit you under their *Banners*, yet the other sort of *Articulate Words*, which have no manner of Signification, may; and then to *Scindapsus, Blictri, Lirum, Larum, Screlum, Scraulum*, we may add *Articles*. But why so fast, say you, I shall in the next Leaf shelter *Articles* under *Adjective*, and so all your Railery returns on your self. You should then have plac'd it under your Explanation of *Adjectives*, if you design'd not to puzzle the Learner by observing no manner of *Method*, which you have indeed no regard to, in any Part of your Book, as will be evident from the Sequel. When *several Things* are plac'd under *certain Heads*, the Learner, when in Doubt, knows where to look for what he wants; and those Things, which are confided to the Memory in Order, are so preserv'd there: But *Confusion* can no more bring forth Order, than *Chance*; and a Man must have a pretty large share of Absurdity, to believe the contrary.

Your *Heads and Divisions*, your *Parts of Speech* and *Parts of Grammar*, are always at odds about Precedence, like the Curate's Wife of the Parish. Here we find one set first in the *Division*, and yet comes last to be treated of; another towards the End pushes forward, and is first taken Notice of. If this be not *clear Method*, I know not what is. Thus I find your 8th Chapter treating of *Prepositions*, of which, I did not expect to hear one Word for some Time: But *Preposition* has been so us'd to hand the Lady *Verb*, that he is now grown sawcy, and thrusts himself into the middle of *Noun*, in hopes suddenly to get before him too. Well, but how could *Preposition* come into the middle of your Considerations on *Nouns*? You answer, because they
E are

are most conversant about *Nouns*; but they are likewise us'd in *Conjunction* with *Verbs*. But, Sir, granting them us'd most about *Substantives*, yet, by the due order of *METHOD*, they cannot divide our Consideration of the *Noun*, which ought to be first dispatch'd, before one Word can *methodically*, or without Confusion, be said of the other. And the Reason you give for placing them here, is much stronger for placing them in *Syntax*; for you say, *Because the Meaning of these Particles or little Words, being rightly understood, the WHOLE SYNTAX, AND CONSTRUCTION OF SUBSTANTIVES, IS LEARN'D AT THE SAME TIME.* What, must we start from *Words*, before we have half learn'd them, to go to *Syntax*? and then leap back again to *Words*, with as imperfect a Knowledge of as mere a Smattering in *Construction*? Is this *Method*? Is this *Clearness*? Or rather a preposterous confounding all Things together? For if this be *ORDER*, there can be no *CONFUSION*. You tell us, indeed (p. 72.) That you are *SENSIBLE*, that what you have here done, is but *SLIGHT*, and *SUPERFICIAL*, to what might, and OUGHT TO BE DONE; but that if this meet with any *ENCOURAGEMENT*, you MAY be EXPECTED to make *FARTHER Improvements in these Matters*, by taking more Pains to observe nicely the several *Postures of the Mind in Discourse*. The *Postures of the Mind*, is, I confess, something nice, and a sublime Expression, and so high above *common Sense*, that I shall say nothing to it. But, pray Sir, if you were sensible, that what you had done, was *slight* and *superficial*, why did you put it in *Print*, before you had, by considering the several *POSTURES of the Mind*, brought it to that Perfection, of which you knew it capable, by your Help and Assistance? Does he deserve the *Encouragement* of the Town, who tells them plainly he has palm'd on them a *slight, superficial Trifle*, for a *labour'd Work*? A *VOLUNTARY*, as I may call your Work, is without Excuse, if the Author does not do his *Best*, and give us some *valuable Improvements in the Art* he treats of. I suppose you were under no *Necessity* of publishing

publishing crude Embryo's, before you had lick'd them into Form: I suppose you might have delay'd your Book two or three Years longer, without any Detriment to your *Reputation*; and then you had dealt more fairly and honestly with your *Subscribers* and *Buyers*. But you, dear Sir, are a *Person*, of all *Persons*, that have so peculiar an *Air* and Address in all you give us of the *Thoughtless* and the *Blunder*, that you are truly worthy our *Admiration*. There is nothing more remarkable in this Chapter, than that you seem here to begin to be weary of *Questions* and *Answers*; giving us but two here, and those *nothing at all* to the purpose; and all that should have been said about the *Prepositions*, is pass'd over in profound *Silence*. So now we have done with *Prepositions*, we come at last to the other Branch of *Nouns*, call'd *Adjectives*; tho' this is imperfect, since the *Articles* (a part of their Band) have given them the slip, and thrust themselves before the *Substantives*; so that there is a sort of *Hayes* danc'd among them, first **NOUN**, then **ARTICLE**, **PREPOSITION**, then **NOUN** again, and so on.

I cannot get over your whimsical Chapter of *Expletives*, for you tell us, they are Words unnecessary to the *Construction* and *Sense* of the *Discourse*; and in this Number you reckon, *for*, *from*, *now*, *then*, &c. But, Sir, are *for* and *from* no Part of our *Construction*? What then becomes of the *Prepositions*, the Knowledge of which was just now to give us so great an *Insight* into the *Construction* of *Nouns*? Nay, at your Rule of arguing, you may throw out most of our Monosyllables from *Construction*, and not a few of our other Words. All indeed you prove in this Chapter, is, that when People speak *improperly* and *incorrectly*, they use Words of no manner of Use to *Construction* and *Sense*. A worthy Discovery I confess! But why must *unto* be made an *Expletive*, more than *to*, since it is far more ancient? And that, methinks, should recommend it very effectually to the Favour of such an excellent Antiquary in our Language. But your Derivation of the Word *Expletive*, contradicts your *Definition* of it; you

say it is deriv'd from *Explere*, because it does, as it were, fill up the *Sentence*, with which, you say, it has nothing to do in Sense or Construction. But *Contradictions* are your chosen Beauties of Writing, and therefore not to be attack'd by one of your Admirers.

But I am affraid, Sir, I have already offer'd you so many *Amendments*, that you will not be so good as your Word, to insert them in their *proper* Places. And therefore, being sufficiently tir'd with this *No-Part* of YOUR *Grammar*, I think I had best make a Leap to some of its real Parts. But hold, I find a Call to make Haste, like a true Knight Errant, laying aside all other Adventures, to the Assistance of a poor Lady in Distress under your *Didactic* Hands. I mean Madam ORTHOGRAPHY, whom, the last time we saw her, we found in a very flourishing Condition, in the very *Front* of your Division of *Grammar*; there you seem'd to give her Hopes of your Smiles and good Graces; at least, that she should preserve that Place, to which she had so good a Title to by Prescription. And I am of Opinion, that your *Unwillingness* to say any thing about her, would have gone to a total Omission of her, had not your *Antagonist* us'd her more civilly, and Dr. Wallis himself said something in her Commendation; which you were not willing to slight, since it would add so many Leaves to your Book. But let us see what you say, p. 231. This PART OF GRAMMAR, say you very ingeniously, (and that is much from so Dogmatic a Person) OUGHT to have been treated of FIRST; but WE have for SOME Reasons reserv'd it to this Place. This puts me in mind of a certain whimsical Fellow, who having invited some of his Neighbours to Dinner, had the Tarts, Cheese, and Butter, serv'd in first, with this odd Apology: "Tis true, Neighbours, the Beef, the Fowl, and the Fish, should have been brought to the Table first, but 'tis my Whim; you must know, I love to invert Order, and run counter to Mankind, for some Reasons best known to my self; and therefore, as you see, with me what should be first, shall be last. And how can we help

help all this? we must be rul'd by the Founder of the Feast. These Things will be, if we sell Ale, or write Books, and there's an end on't.

I confess I did expect from a Man of your *Politeness* and *Learning*, your Acquaintance with Mr. Lock, &c. that you would have given us, at least, *one* Reason for making so great an Innovation; and *one* Reason out of so many, would undoubtedly have made you never the poorer. But what must be, must be. Perhaps you thought you were *oblig'd* to give a Reason, and an Obligation, is a sort of *Compulsion*; and you, like *Falstaff*, would not give us a Reason on *Compulsion*: What, a Reason on *Compulsion* HALL? No, were Reasons as plentiful as Black-berries, I would not give a Reason on *Compulsion*, no, not I.

I find, indeed, that you are in a sort of Agony, and I pity you from the very Bottom of my Heart. *And here* (say you, with a sort of a Sigh) *I cannot dessemble my Unwillingness to say any thing at all* ON THIS Head. How, my dear Friend, did you think your Division of GRAMMAR *just*, and yet not think this Part of *your own* DIVISION worthy saying any thing *at all* to? This sounds very odd in the Ears of us poor Mortals, who judge by *common Sense*, and the Rules of *Art* and Reason. But it is confess'd, that you are a Person of that *transcendent Sublimity*, that you move in a Sphere above us, and are not to be shackl'd with *Sense*, and Reason, and *Art*.

But I perceive you are now in a better Humour, than you were two or three Lines before; for you will here not only give us *first*, but *second* too. In good Faith, I thank you with all my Heart, for I almost long'd for a Reason from you; which is the more relishing by being uncommon, and out of your Way. Well, not to baulk the indulgent Humour, let us have them. FIRST, *Because of the irregular, and wrong Pronunciation of the* LETTERS and WORDS, *which if one should go about to mend, would be a Business of great Labour and Trouble, as well as fruitless and unsuccessful. Many have been the Endeavours of this Kind, but it has been found*
impossi-

impossible to stem the Tide of prevailing Custom. I shall take no Notice of the *Lameness* of the Expression, for Politeness in that, is what no Body expects from so learn'd a Person. Your Meaning I take to be this, That because there are several Sounds belonging to the *same Letter*, all which we know perfectly well, you would not direct your Learner how to spell, as the Learned do spell according to Custom. I confess this is an invincible Reason indeed. *But it is a Business of great Labour and Trouble.* But since this could not deter a Person of your Industry, from the voluntarily Undertaking the Trouble of writing a new Grammar, without any Improvement upon one that you had near a Year before your Eyes; can, I say, Difficulty, which inflames the *Great*, dath so magnanimous a Person as *Mr. Greenwood*? No, no, this is thrown in *ex abundante*. But it would be *fruitless* and *unsuccessful*. Nay, to work hard to no purpose, is, I confess, Discouragement enough. But how can you, who seem not to want *Self-Sufficiency* in your own Parts, doubt of *Success* in any thing you undertake? What, tho' others have fail'd? That implies no Necessity that you must do so too. Try, Man, try, I am confident you cannot have *worse Success* with that, than in what you have already attempted; it could at worst be but all of a Piece. Come, come, be of good Courage, *faint Heart ne'er won fair Lady.* *Scioppius* complain'd of the vast Number of Exceptions to the Rules of the common *Latin Grammar*; which, indeed, were much more numerous, than our Rules of *Orthography*; and yet he reduc'd them to a much smaller Number. Who knows then, but a Person of your *Sagacity* and *Penetration*, may perform as great a Work, for the Benefit of your MOTHER TONGUE?

Well, but SECONDLY. Oh! I love *secondly* excessively; 'tis like the *second Bottle*, as my Lord *Rocheſter* observes in his Letter to *Harry Saville*, which opens all our Secrets, unbosoms our Hearts, and takes away all Disguise. Well then SECONDLY, *Because the multiplying of Rules for the PRONUNCIATION, rather*
con-

confounds, than helps the Learner; since the Rule can be of little Service, that admits of such a vast Number of Exceptions, as most of the Rules COMMONLY laid down, GENERALLY do. But if the Exceptions are now too many, and the Rules insufficient to compass this End, you had done like another *Scioppius*, and something worthy Praise, if you had found out better, and more extensive. But if these which we have, were such as could not be improv'd by the very Nature of our Language, why did you deny us all the Helps we can have, and yet give us none in their Room?

——— *Siquid novisti, reclinus istis
Candidus imperti, si non, his utere mecum.*

If you could not improve, why did you undertake so barren a Province for your incomparable Pen? Did you write only for Writing Sake? You do by us in this Case, as if some had perswaded the Roman Architects not to carry their Stones a little Height on Mens Backs, or against making Use of sloping Mounts of Earth, level with their Work, by which they roll'd up their Stones to what Height they pleas'd, because it was inconvenient, when they did not know those Engins, which we make Use of to do the Business with more Ease.

But hold, fair and softly goes far! I find you will give us a better Way. Well, pray God it be *John*. Let us therefore hear it. *I have therefore often thought*, (I am glad on't, with all my Heart; for by your Writing, we should scarce have imagin'd that you ever thought at all) *that some other Way OUGHT to be found out, to render this Matter more EASY and EXPEDITIOUS; and the ONLY and BEST* (nay, if the ONLY, it must certainly be the BEST) *that I can think of, is, the making a BOOK* (you have a strange Fancy for making BOOKS on every Occasion that offers) *that shall contain all the Varieties of PRONUNCIATION; beginning with Syllables and Words, that are pronounc'd according to the most SIMPLE Sounds of the Letters; and thence PROCEEDING gradually to SYLLABLES and WORDS,*

WORDS, that are pronounc'd otherwise, than they are written, and contrary to the natural and genuine Sound of the Letters. First here is again a *Participle* put for a *Verb*; a peculiar Figure of *Stile* with you.

But is this indeed, Sir, your *only* and *best* Way? Why, this has been already done by several *Spelling-Books*, and must labour under the Difficulties you lay on your present Rules; nay, it would oblige the Learner to get *Dictionaries* without Book. You say, that *Pronunciation* is only to be taught by the *Ear*, not by *Reading*. To what Purpose then this new intended Book? You would come off, by obliging the Master to read to the Scholar; yet this labours under as great Difficulties, as any other Way; since it supposes, that *Masters* or *School-Mistresses*, in the very extreamest Parts of the Nation, must be acquainted with the *true* and *just* *Pronunciation*; and then any Book would do as well, as your new design'd Piece of *Sentences* and *Stories*. But after all, do you not think, that Dr. Wallis's Rules of *Pronunciation*, are able to do this Work? Your *Antagonist* and you have both been familiar with him, with this Difference; he gave us him first in *English*, and put what relates to *Vowels*, at the End of *Vowels*, and what relates to *Consonants*, at the End of *Consonants*; and recommends to the Master the Study of them, because he may by them, with Ease, direct the Scholar right, by telling him how the *Sounds* are mechanically form'd. You have indeed translated the same Tract, but put it altogether at the End of your Book, as a Thing of *Speculation*, not *Practice*. You might have spar'd your *Latin* Quotation of *Quæ nec SCRIBITUR, nec pingitur nec eam hauriri fas est, nisi vivâ voce*. That is, Which can be neither written nor painted, but must be learnt by Use; and the hearing of others pronounce. So that you would have this Part of *Grammar* kept like the Doctrines of the *Druids* and *Pythagoras*, in the *Mind* only, and confided to oral Tradition. But, dear Sir, Dr. Wallis has prov'd by Experience, that Sound may, in some Measure, be convey'd to, and taught the *Deaf* and *Dumb*, who cannot hear them at all; and that only

ly by the Observation of the framing the Organs of Speech; the Eye supplying here the Defect of the Ear. Now, if this can, by this Means, be taught the *Dumb*, and the *Deaf*, with how much more Ease may Children, who can hear, be instructed in it? Since the Master, by telling them, that to pronounce such or such a Letter, you *must place your Tongue thus, your Lips in this Manner*, and the like. Nay, this will instruct the Teachers themselves in the most remote Parts, where *true Pronunciation* is not so common as at *Hackney*. As for Mr. Ray's Observation, p. 233. that our *Alphabet* is *deficient* in some Respects, and *superfluous* in others, it is no more, than what he might have said of those of all the *modern Tongues*; nay, of the *dead Languages* too, according to our modern Pronunciation, in which each Nation will force in something *vernacular*. But I cannot see of what Use this is to the Purpose, tho' true: Nor is the *Reformation*, propos'd by Mr. Ray, p. 240. practicable, unless you would have all the Books in the *English Tongue* new printed, according to his *Orthography*, nay, and every *English-man* taught again to read. As for his Offence to *Children* and *Foreigners*, 'tis a mere *Jest*, since they may, by a few Rules, be directed to our present Way of *Speaking*. Besides, Mr. Lodwick, in the *Philosophical Transactions*, has done this to his Hands, and set down a *new* and *perfect Alphabet*, according to all the real Variation of Sounds.

You begin your third Chapter, Part IV. very copiously, according to your Custom, saying the same Thing twice over, viz. When two VOWELS meet together in one Syllable, they are call'd DIPHTHONGS, or DOUBLE VOWELS: And then in a larger Letter, A DIPHTHONG, or DOUBLE VOWEL, is the meeting of two VOWELS in ONE and the SAME Syllable. I beseech you, Sir, to let us know whether the small Print be to illustrate the larger, or vice versa? Can a Syllable be one, and not the same Syllable when two Vowels make a Diphthong?

But, good Sir, how came your N. B. p. 250. on the Diphthong (ou) among the Consonants? which ought to

have been plac'd under the Head (*ou*)? But *clear Method* and *Order* is what you have declar'd War against, as *mean* and *mechanic*. How came you to leave out your *Questions* and *Answers*, at the End of your fourth Chapter on *Consonants*? Were not the *Consonants* of Importance enough to be repeated? I hope you will not throw them away too; yet, if you have such a *Frolick*, it will shorten the Trouble extreamly, and lessen the Number of Rules.

Well, p. 255. we come at last to the *ultimate* Chapter of this Part, which, by the Title, is to treat of *Syllables*. But what do you say of them? Why, faith, like Mr. *Bays*, nothing at all, egad, ha! ha! ha! All that you say relating to them, is, that you will not say a *Syllable* of them. They are indeed the compleating Part of your *Grammar*, for which you have no Manner of Kindness, tho' you chose *voluntarily* to make a real Part of it. But let us hear, and edify. *Spelling* being the PARTING Words into convenient PARTS, (*parting* into *Parts*, is elegant, *dividing* had not been near so excellent, 'tis a Figure call'd *Cacophony*) in order to show their true PRONUNCIATION, or for Decency of Writing. The GRAMMARIANS have given SEVERAL Rules for the performing this Matter. But. — Aye, this But is a dead-doing Particle. But as Nature is most easy, and simple in all her Operations; so cannot I, for my Life, get it out of my Head, but that a due OBSERVANCE and IMITATION of her, would be as serviceable, as the following a great many of the magisterial and perplex'd Directions of Persons, that compel others to beat that Path, they themselves have so often trod, tho' perhaps there may be one, but just HARD by, that is more pleasant, delightful, and much better. I need not transcribe the whole Paragraph, in which indeed, as Mr. *Bays* says, you have shown what a Satyrist you are. I faith it bites *some where*! there is a Bob for *some Body*, but the Lord knows where, or whom. Your Capacity of Reasoning we have seen all along, and now and then a Fling at the *Makers of Grammar*, or *Grammarians*. But here you bring *Scaliger*, *Bangins*, and the famous *Comenius*;

Comenius, to back you; and who can withstand so terrible and united a Force? But your Misfortune here, is, that *Authorities* against *Reason*, favours something of ridiculous *Pedantry*. I am, Sir, almost perswaded, that it would puzzle even your great Talent in Teaching, to make a Man of common Sense know what you mean by *Nature's* being EASY and SIMPLE in all her Operations, and by imitating her in Spelling. Because instituted Grammar, as you call it, all the World till now took for an Art, founded on Compact, or Agreement of Men of such or such a Place or Country, to express such Ideas, by such Words, and compound such Words of such Letters; but that the Sounds made use of by any particular Language, and the Letters that express those Sounds, are in Nature, or can be learn'd or taught by Nature, I confess my self too dull to conceive.

If the Letters, Spelling, &c. were essentially founded in Nature, then would they be the same all over the World. And this, Sir, you might have found justify'd by Mr. Lock, in his third Book of *Human Understanding*, with the Beginning the second Chapter of which, you face your Introduction. Chap. 2. Lib. 3. immediately after these Words, in your Introduction: For which Purpose, nothing was so fit, either for Plenty or Quickness, as those articulative Sounds, call'd WORDS, which, with so much Ease and Variety, he found himself able to make. You might have found Mr. Lock go on in this manner. Thus we may conceive how WORDS, which were by NATURE so well adapted to that Purpose, came to be made use of by Men, as the Signs of their IDEAS, not by any NATURAL CONNECTION, that there is between particular articulate Sounds, and CERTAIN IDEAS; FOR THEN THERE WOULD BE BUT ONE LANGUAGE AMONG ALL MEN, but by a VOLUNTARY Imposition, whereby such a WORD is made ARBITRARILY to mark such an IDEA. And again, Chap. 6. Now, since Sounds have NO NATURAL Connection with our IDEAS, but have all their Significations from the ARBITRARY Imposition of Men, the DOUBTFULNESS and UNCERTAINTY of their

Signification, which is the Imperfection we are here speaking of, has its Cause more in the IDEAS, they stand for, than in any Capacity there is in ONE Sound more, than in another, to signify any IDEA, &c. If this won't satisfy you, Sir, consult my Lord Bacon, in his Advancement of Learning, Lib. 6.

I confess I do not know what *Logic* you read at *Hackney*, but I am sure my *Logic* tells me, that in the Definition of *Names*, every Man has the Liberty of fixing what *Idea* he pleases, to any certain Sound, which in it self is of no Consequence.

After all this, Sir, I fancy you will own (if you will own any thing against you) that the *Easiness* and *Simplicity* of Nature in all her Operations, are Words that even signify nothing at all; or, which is as much as I desire, *nothing to the Purpose*, or Point in Hand. I cannot for my Life (to borrow your polite Expression) get it out of my Head, that when you talk of a *due Observance and Imitation of Nature*, &c. you only design a down right Banter on *common Sense*. For, my dear good Friend, what Part of Nature must we observe so duly, and imitate so closely, to arrive at the Art of *Spelling*? Her Operations in the Fields, in the flowery Meads, the purling Brooks, the shady Groves, or the like? Or, must we, by the Study of ASTRONOMY, observe the Order, and several Revolutions of the Planets, with their several Aspects, and by them find out which is the justest way of dividing *Ignis, omnis, Piscis*, which *Scaliger* raises his Disquisition upon? Yet even he even your beloved *Scaliger*, gives up the Cause at last, by owning, that he can allow something to the Elegancy of *Painting*. I should be surpriz'd (if any thing you say can surprize me) that you should be so fond of *Scaliger's* Authority, who tells, us that the *Articles* are of no Use, because the *Latin* Tongue has none; whereas 'tis plain to any one, that knows the Meaning and Use of *a* and *the*, that he is in the wrong; for you your self grant, that they restrain, and determine the Signification of *Names*, from *Generals* to *Particulars*. Nay, he is so bold a Critic, as to find Fault

Fault with and Redicule, *Homer's* Diction. That is, he pretends to know the Beauty, Property, and Elegance of the *Greek*, better, than the best Author in that Tongue; whom the facetious Dr. *Coward* has copy'd in his *sublime* Preface to his *Licentia Poetica*; which Piece, Sir, for want of a *Profody*, I recommend to you, to Bind up with your *Grammar*; it will be more of a Piece with it, than that learned Discourse of Dr. *WALLIS* in *nubibus*. But to proceed, must we, with *Democritus*, dissect the Animals, and observe the *easy* Operations of *Nature* in *Anatomy*? Or, What Point of this manyfold Name *NATURE*, is to be the Object of our Observation, that we may arrive at this Excellency with *more Ease*, than by a very few Rules, drawn from the Use and Practice of the Learned? Bnt, dear *Seraplum*, consider, whether while you are writing of an *Art* you are not opening a Door to *Confusion* and *Ignorance*. For by destroying all the receiv'd Rules of *Art*, and substituting *none* in their Room, you leave all to be guilty of those *Blunders*, which you have in your Preface objected to the young *Gentlemen* and *Ladies*, viz. *false Spelling*! For while you refer all to the *undirected* Humour of every one that writes, (your *Nature* being nothing but *uninform'd*, and *unbounded* Fancy) you fix the Matter on this Head, that there can be *NO false Spelling at all*. For if the Syllables must be parted, as they sound best to the Ear, and in Writing, as they seem best to the Eye, every Body being Judges of this, as they must be, unless you fix a Standard of these *Bests*; then all the *Scraelum Seraplum* of the *Gallery*, nay, *Billingsgate*, and *Wapping Damosels*, will be as just *Spelling*, as that of the ingenious and learned Mr. *Greenwood* himself. Let me therefore beg of you, for the sake of you own *Grammar*, either to lay down better Rules, than we have already, or else take not those Guides away to leave us to ramble in the *Dark* to learn of *Nature*, what *Nature* has nothing to do withal. I know some *Dear Joys*, and some *Beaux* too, who would celebrate your Praise for *Ever* and for *Ay*, if you could bring this to bear; since their *Billet Deaux* would pass
much

much better, in such an *Uncertainty of Truth*, than now they are oblig'd to be *Ridiculous*, without knowing the *Art of Spelling*.

As for yor smart Reflections on some Body, I know not who; for being ignorant of the *worthy Arts of Wheedling* of Children, and managing them according to their *Temper*; I cannot say much about it; 'tis certainly a very good Qualification of a Teacher. But why you should engross, by *Innuendo*, this important Science, I cannot imagine; you have given no such publick Proof of your Abilities in other Things above your Neighbours, to perswade us to believe, that you have the Advantage of all Men in this; yet, if you really have this *secret Art*, if you have a Grain of publick Spirit, or even of Self-love, (and 'tis much if you have neither) for the Good of all your *Brother Pedagogues*, nay, for the common Good of all *Learners*, or if all these fail to move you, for the Good of your own *Reputation*, that you may satisfy the World, that you do really understand *something*, publish this admirable Art. But I would advise you to do with your *Impression*, what the Bookfellers sometimes do with theirs, admit none but of the Trade to the Auction; so if none but your *Fraternity* buy these Books, you may be safer in *Reputation* and *Profit* too, than if they should fall into Hands not bound to you by so strict a Tye, as *Brotherhood of Profession*.

But, dear Sir, what ever *Art* of Wheedling you may have to insinuate into the Temper of the Child; I am sure it cannot be by the *easy* Lessons you lay down, nor by the *clear, intelligible* Expressions, or the *lucid Order* of your *Grammar*, or what you call Explanation of *Terms* (that is, of explaining Words that are half *English*, by Words that are purely *Latin*.) So you would do well to publish another Volume, to explain this, and bring it into some tolerable *Order* and *Forms*.

I was just going to throw aside your *Grammar*, finding that I was come to the three *Praxes* of Dr. Wallis; but your peculiar *Favourite*, *N. B.* gave Observation such a Bang, that I could not proceed to my Recapitulation, till I had seen what those remarkable Letters

ters pointed to, having all along found them to relate to some *notable* Matter ; and what should I discover in this melancholy *Nook*, but *English Profody*, like the *Spartan Helena*, amidst the Ruins of *Troy*, and only sav'd from Destruction by the Goddess of Beauty, who had given her for a Reward to the wanton *Trajan Shepherd* ? *Profody*, the Mother of that Melody, and those musical Numbers which make our Stile flow with enchanting *Harmony*, I, to my Surprise, found crowded into a Corner, without one Word said of her ; tho', like *Orthography*, made by you, Sir, an *essential* Part of your Division of *Grammar*. Ha ! Madam, said I, what do I find your Ladyship, who make so worthy a Figure in *Grammar*, an Outcast in this, which is propos'd as the most excellent Performance of the Kind ? I confess I did fear that you were wholly laid aside ; but I am glad to find your Ladyship here, tho' without your Attendance and Equipage. Alas ! Sir, replies she, I am laid aside ; I cannot get into this Book for my Life, except in being allow'd, by the Author, an *essential* Part of his *Grammar*. Ah ! Madam, (interrupted I) that is *sufficient* Cause for your Exclusion, with this Author. Pardon me, assum'd *Profody*, I must say one Thing in his Behalf ; it was *Modesty*, (perhaps you may not believe me, and yet I must say again) it was *Modesty* in this young bashful *Grammarian*, (or Writer of *Grammar*, as he necessarily and worthily explains it) I treat of *Numbers* or *Quantities*, that make both *Prose* and *Verse* flow gently, strongly, nobly ; and I therefore am a Thing of which he knows nothing at all ; how then should I expect any Complement from him ? He is so *modest*, as to say nothing of what he does not understand. But, Madam, said I, I am afraid that Reason will not hold good, if we judge by the *rest* ; for if his *Modesty* had made him silent of what he did not understand, he must have said nothing of the other three Parts ; and so *Grammar*, instead of having four Parts, would have had none at all ; and so, honest *Scindapsus*, adieu.

As

As for your *Syntax*, it contains so little in so many Words, which are so full of Blunders, that I shall defer my Considerations of it, 'till I am sensible, that what I have already said, has not been able to convince you, that every Part else of your Work being so inconsistent and inconsiderate, it was superfluous to waste Time about this, which, in the very Beginning, you own to be imperfect, and dissipated thro' your other Parts; which alone is a Proof of a blundering Method, and that it is not worth our farther Consideration.

Thus I have made Shift to get through your heavy Way, and shewn you some few of those *numerous Blunders* of your excellent Performance, and which I commend to your Consideration: But that they may sink with the greater Force into your Mind, by a farther Conviction, I shall, by Way of *Recapitulation*, consider more closely the *Absurdity* of your *Method* in your *Division*, in your *Terms*, in your *Rules*, and the like, and plainly *demonstrate*, that you have been so far from *improving* the *English Grammar*, that you have fallen much short of the first Essay of your *Antagonist*, whose Errors I would no more indulge, than yours, tho' more excuseable, since he was the first, and you had the Advantage of his to be clear of all Fault your self.

I must now therefore take a full View of your *Method*, and by that see how justly you have perform'd.

The true Art of *didactic Method*, is, to divide justly, define clearly; to teach those Things in the first Place, on the Knowledge of which the Things that follow, has any Dependence; to keep close to your Division, and your Definitions; to make your Precepts, or Rules, as few in Number, as the Nature of the Subject will permit, and in them to have a peculiar Regard to Significance and Easiness: That is, that the Terms of Art be of such a Nature, that they will not require any Knowledge of any other Language, than of that in which you write, or demand difficult and tedious Explanations.

By this Standard, which is evidently founded on Reason, let us examine your Performance. And here it seems proper to observe, that to attain this *Method* and

and Order, the Author should be thoroughly Master of his Subject, and be able to treat of it with Judgment; for, as *Horace* has long ago observ'd,

— Cui lecta potenter erit Res
Nec Facundia deferet hunc, nec lucidus Ordo.

After a serious and judicious Choice,
Method and Eloquence will never fail.

Roscomi

And wherever we find Confusion, we may, without Injustice, affirm, that the Author was not Master of his Subject; and therefore very unfit to instruct others. But from what has been said, and what is yet to be offer'd, 'tis evident, Sir, that in your *Grammar* this Confusion is every where to be met with. Tho' in many Places you have Collections of some valuable Observations, yet they are little, or nothing to the Purpose, and always in such Confusion, that they puzzle me, whatever they may do a Child of five or six, or seven or eight Years old; and tho' you give us a Division, (of which immediately) yet you do not seem to have made any Scheme of your Book, before you set your self to write, and for that Reason you set Things down as they recur to your Memory; but whether in the right and proper Place or not, you seem not much to care. Thus, p. 109. you say thus: *But these are call'd ADVERBS, and therefore ought to have been plac'd among them.* Ought they so? And why then were they not? Why were they not defer'd to their proper Place? Thus we find you frequently bidding us see such and such a Chapter, about a Thing, that ought to have been plac'd where the References are put, which, in a Book of the Nature of your *Grammar*, is a certain Sign of an artless Confusion; and shows yours to be only a loose Collection, without any Manner of Digestion. Thus many Things, which are very material to the Learner's Understanding, as particular Parts of Speech, are thrown into your Notes, (I mean what seem to be your Notes) without any Form of a Rule, but in the Man-

ner of a Disquisition, whence a Child's Memory can receive little of Use to his Understanding. Nothing can be more confus'd, than your Chapter of *Verbs*, as we shall see when we come to that Head.

You have another Fault which brings your Judgment very much into Question ; and that is, of obtruding on us what particular Authors say, without reflecting whether it be just, or not ; or whether 'it be so in this Place, and on this Occasion. Now, a Compiler (tho' he ought to consult all he can, yet) is to understand and digest them so well, as to choose only what is just and valuable.

You seem indeed very like Mr. *Bays* ; and your *Method* is to you, what his Plot was to him, *viz.* to bring in *fine Things*. Mr. *Bays's fine Things* and yours indeed differ ; his were for the *Ladies*, yours for the *Learned* ; his *Similies*, your *Catalogues* ; his *Rants*, your *N. B.'s*.

I have already shewn the Defect of your Definition of *Grammar*, as not comprising the chief End of *Grammar* ; I shall only add here, that it is likewise obscure ; for we are as much to seek what *rightly* is, as we should be for the Art, if there were no Definition at all. It is true, the Word *Rightly*, is not of such various Use, as *Recte* in *Latin* ; yet it admits a great deal of Dispute, and requires a great many Words to explain what you mean by it.

In the next Place, the *Division* is not *just* ; for it leaves out the several Parts of Speech, their Definitions, Accidents, and Formation : For your *Division* of *Grammar* is into *Orthography*, *Prosody*, *Etymology*, and *Syntax*. To make the Defect visible, let us put these hard Words into *English*, *Letters* and *Spelling*, *Quantity*, *Derivation*, *Construction*. Now, of these four Parts, you your self reject two, *Orthography* and *Prosody*, and a third has nothing to do with *Grammar* ; that is, *Etymology*, or *Derivation* ; it gives us indeed the Source and Origin of certain Words ; but this is of no Use to the Construction of Words in a *Sentence*, or their Nature as *Parts of Speech* ; and is much more proper for a *Dictionary*, where the Sense and Meaning of Words are

are more immediately consider'd. I confess there is something of Curiosity, and what's fit enough to amuse those, who have nothing else to do, but 'tis absolutely losing Time, when we are in Pursuit of the Knowledge of Words in their Relation to each other in Sentences, or, as I have said, in their Nature as they are Parts of Speech. For you have indeed most ingeniously, and with a great deal of Address, found out and laid down such a *Division* of the Parts of *Grammar*, as entirely excludes every one of your eight Parts of Speech, as if they were no Part of *Grammar*; a Happiness, that no other Author of *Grammar* ever yet obtain'd.

From hence it is plain, that you not only made a wrong *Division* of your Parts of *Grammar*, in Regard of excluding one half of your Book, but also, by rejecting or neglecting (call it which you please) those *Parts* which you had granted necessary; and spending so many Leaves upon another Part, which has no Manner of Thing to do with the Business of *Grammar*. Besides these Errors in the Fundamentals, there are several other, as your teaching those Things last, on the Knowledge of which, all that goes before, has an immediate Dependance; for *Orthography* is the Ground-Work, or Foundation of all the other Parts, and therefore ought to have been deliver'd first, both in Regard to your own *Division*, to which you are always oblig'd to keep, and to the very Nature of the Thing it self.

And here I must observe, that these are Errors which are not excuseable, because they must of Necessity produce Confusion, and show, that you are not acquainted sufficiently with your Subject, and cannot therefore convey it clearly to any one else.

Your *Antagonist* has visibly the Advantage of you in this; for his *Division* is not only in Words easy and familiar to the meanest Capacity, but contains, under its several Parts, the whole Subject of *Grammar*; and he all along keeps to the *Division* he had once made. Nor has he taught that last, which must be first known, in order to understand the rest. *Letters, Syllables, Words,*

and *Sentences*, are not only entirely *English*, and therefore save all you have said in Explanation of your Terms; but he has in this follow'd Dr. Wallis, the great Mr. Arnaud, the *Messieurs* of Port-Royal, and others, as well as the very Nature, which is the Reason, of the Thing. But whatever Faults are to be found in his Method or Performance, have some Excuse, by being the first Edition of that Performance; but you, coming out upon him full of your self, and with Threats of destroying the Opinion, that had obtain'd in the Town, and failing in every Particular, are inexcusable, since you have made not one Improvement upon him. You have not in the *Method*, either as to the general *Disposition* of your Book, or the particular Rules of it; we have just seen how faulty and confus'd your *Division* is; and we may say this in general of your *particular Rules*, they are so obscure, that we cannot discover, with any manner of Certainty, which are *Rules*, and which are *Notes*; which are to be learn'd by the *Scholar*, which study'd and known by the *Teacher*. If we might judge by Reason, we should imagine at least, that all the *Questions* and *Answers* should be got by Heart; and that is doubling the Load of the *Memory*. If all the *Text* of your Antagonist's *Grammar*, were to be got without Book, it would not be half your Task.

But it may be objected, that I need not descend to Particulars, to shew how worthless your Book is; since he who is confus'd, and uncertian in the Method of his Division, must of Consequence be so in his Rules which are built on that *Division*. Yet, to satisfy you, Sir, that I will take nothing for granted against you, but what I shall prove from *Particulars*, I shall examine your *Superstructure*, as well as I have your *Foundation*, and so let you see, that they are worthy one another. But then, on the other Hand, you cannot expect, that I should be so very particular, as to remark on every individual Blunder; that would be a Labour insupportable to me, and tedious to the Reader; I shall content my self therefore, with some of the most notorious, and by those leave the Reader to find out the Rest, if I have not given

given him enow to satisfy him, that you are not at all equal to your Undertaking.

As you are out of your geneneral *Division*, which does not take in the under *Division* of the Parts of Speech, as it ought to do, to be Compleat, so are you out in the latter.

You divide Language into eight Parts, according to the old Way, and so put a Distinction betwixt Words, between which Nature has made none. For the Parts of Speech do in Nature fall under but four Heads, or Differences; and therefore they should not be made more numerous by *Art*. But you, I find, are for quitting Nature, where she does visibly prescribe, as in Words; and for following her where she is not to be found, as in Spelling. By this means you make your Rules more numerous; for the multiplying Parts of Speech, must of necessary Consequence multiply Rules.

But that this Division is wrong, is plain from Reason. First Mr. Johnson, in his *Grammatical Commentaries*, condemns this Enumeration of the Parts of Speech in Lilly, thus: *It had been better in the Enumeration of the Parts of Speech, to have made the SUBSTANTIVE and the ADJECTIVE two distinct Parts of Speech, and to have comprehended the PARTICIPLE under the ADJECTIVE. For the SUBSTANTIVE and the ADJECTIVE are two very different Parts of Speech, the Substantive signifying the Thing, the Adjective only the Denomination of the SUBSTANTIVE from some Accident, in which the PARTICIPLE agrees exactly with the ADJECTIVE, as shall more fully appear from the Consideration of SUBSTANTIVE and ADJECTIVE, in their several Definitions.* He defines the Substantive thus, p. 7. *The NAME of a Thing, that may subsist by it self in the Understanding, so as to be the Subject of Predication.* And the Adjective, p. 8. *An ADJECTIVE is a Word added to a SUBSTANTIVE, to declare some additional Accident of the SUBSTANTIVE considered by it self, as of Quality, Property, Relation, Action, Passion, or manner of Being.* To which Places I refer you and the Reader, if you require a farther Conviction from the Reasons he gives.

But

But not to dwell on Authority, when Reason is at Hand, I might refer you to the Beginning of your *Antagonist's* third Part upon WORDS; for there in the *Text*, and the *Notes*, you may see it prov'd beyond a Contradiction, that as Words are made to express the various Operations of the Mind, so they must bear an Analogy to the Things they are to express, and those being of three Kinds, these must be the same, and the fourth is for the just Connection, and Manners of these three. I refer you likewise to the *Messieurs of Port Royal*, in their Art of Speaking, the Reasoning on this Head being too long to be quoted in this Place. As to Participles, both *Dr. Wallis*, and *Scioppius*, long since have agreed with *Mr. Johnson*. See *Scioppius, Institutiones Grammaticae Latinae*. p. 162.

As *Mr. Johnson* has given you up Participles, so he has likewise agreed, that *Pronouns* are the same as *Nouns*, and has prov'd it beyond a fair Reply. p. 10. of his *Grammatical Commentaries*. I refer you likewise to your *Antagonist* on this Head, confute or allow his Reasons, but reflect before you attack him in any of his *Notes*, that they are all built on *Messieurs of Port-Royal*, *Mr. Arnaud*, who has gone the farthest of any Man yet into the Reason and Nature of *Grammar*. Thus *Interjections* being, at most, but Adverbs of Passion, deserve not the Distinction of Parts of Speech, nay, some will not allow them to be so much as Words; Words being made to express the *Ideas* of the Mind, but these only certain natural, not artificial Sounds, which mark the passionate Motions of our Souls. Nor is there any specifick Difference between *Adverbs*, *Conjunctions*, and *Prepositions*, which therefore are justly rang'd under one Title, and make but one *Part of Speech*. For which your *Antagonist's* Reasons must be good, till confuted.

Reason being, therefore, thus manifestly on his Side, to what Purpose should you continue a Burthen, which he had delivered the Learner from, by contracting this Division into half the Compass? You no sooner made your principal Division, but you forsook it both in *Order* and *Sense*; a notorious Sin against Method. Thus
you

you scarce pass from your second *Division*, but you invert and confound the Order of it. You mingle, as I have shown, *Prepositions* and *Articles* with *Nouns*, of which your *Definition* is obscure. A NOUN is the Name of a Thing, &c. but this has been already made out, where I have shown, that you have been oblig'd to make use of the new Term of your *Antagonist's Grammar*, to explain the old Term of yours; by which you own, that it is more familiar and easy, and that, therefore, it ought to be prefer'd to our Use. Nay, indeed, you cannot in reality explain your unintelligible Term, but by his, which still makes against you. But here I would fain find some Excuse for you, and that is, your *Profession*; 'tis that engages you so zealously for the old Terms; for your *Fraternity* have always been the main Obstacle to the improving the Art of Teaching, by being against forsaking the old Way, which has long been found to be tedious and very imperfect, lest if all Things were made easy, there would not be need of so long and slavish an Apprenticeship to Pedagogues. And for this Reason the Cant of *antic Terms* must be kept up, to make the Distinction betwixt the *Learned* and the *Vulgar*.

But it is not in the *Nouns* alone, that you are so obscure and full of Confusion; For there can be nothing more confus'd, than your Chapter of VERBS; you do with the *Verbs* what you had done with the *Nouns*; you divide them, and put in another Part of Speech between them; whereas, the *Auxiliary Verbs*, and their Nature, should have been explain'd first, because the Doctrine of *Verbs* cannot be understood without them. For under this Head you do, what you had before done with your general *Division*, that is, treat of those Things last, on the Knowledge of which what goes before depends; a notorious Sin against Method, by which every Thing should follow in their due Order, and according to their Nature. Your Chapter of *irregular Verbs*, should have come immediately after *Verbs*: For now you skip backward and forward, so that the Learner can make no gradual Rise towards a *regular*, that is, a *sure* and *lasting* Knowledge. Thus you are oblig'd to return a-
gain

gain to the Formation of *Times*, &c. Chap. 17. which ought regularly to have been plac'd where you spoke of *Times* before, Chap. 12. The Title of which is about *Tenses*, or *Times*; we have for the same Reason, the same Things repeated over and over again, as the *Office of auxilliary Verbs*, &c. The Chapter indeed of *Verbs*, is so dark, confus'd, and complicated with hard *Terms*, that if you can make a Child of *seven* or *eight* Years old understand it, you must be allow'd to have a peculiar Art of insinuating your Knowledge, and that Child must be look'd on as an *Honour to Human Understanding*.

You are for rejecting the Rules of *Orthography*, for their Multiplicity, and yet you have made your *Rules*, *Discourses*, or what else you are pleas'd to call them about *Verbs* alone, almost (I might say fully) as long as all those. For you have had no regard to that Rule of Method, which orders the Precepts or Rules to be as few in Number, as the Nature of the Thing will admit, and those express'd as easily and significantly as may be, without *Terms* which require some Knowledge in another Language, than that, which you teach. Nay, you seem to be so mighty fond of explaining Things to the *English Reader* by *Latin*, that even in the very *Questions* and *Answers*, you are at it ding, dong; particularly that Chapter of *Participles*,—*Whence comes the Word Participle?* *Ans.* From *Participium*, that is, a partaking Word, because it *capit Partem*. I will say nothing to the Propriety and Elegance of the Phrase, but would desire to know what Instruction this can be to a Child, who knows not one Word of *Latin*? But your ill Choice of old cramp *Terms*, throws you every Minute on this Rock, which your *Antagonist* avoids, by using Words as easy and obvious, as any the Language affords, and these, being fewer in Number, and easier in *Terms*, must be understood and learn'd with more Ease than yours, which require such long, and such *difficult Explanations*.

Another Instance of your Sin against *Method*, in multiplying needless Rules, is, your *Discourse* of *Verbs*, which

which makes two Sheets of Paper, tho' all that is necessary to be known of that Head, may be deliver'd in less than half a Sheet. Pag. 173. you allow, *That we have not, strictly speaking, any VERBS PASSIVE, that Defect being supply'd by the auxiliary Verbs, &c.* Why then should you burthen the *Learner's* Mind with not only that Division, but with *Verbs Neuter* likewise? You might as well have brought in *Verbs Deponent* and *Common*.

You have given us a whole intricate Chapter on the *Verb Neuter* alone, when indeed there is no such Thing in our Language: You have branch'd it out into a Matter of three or four Parts; and to some of these you give two Names or *Terms*, which brings in Explanations, and Derivations, and the like, to the burthening the *Learner's* Head, and puzzling his Understanding. When all the Rules of the Nature of a Verb, on which you have been so verbose, (except what relates to auxiliary Verbs) may be brought into three Lines in this one Rule: *Whenever a VERB signifies being absolutely, or suffering, or any Action that passes not to another, then it has no NOUN after it of the Subject, otherwise it has.* In these three Lines all the Difficulties are solv'd, which take up so many Leaves of your *Grammar*; and this without any puzzling Terms, or abstruse Explanations, or *Questions* and *Answers*; of which you are so fond, I suppose, because it is old and tedious. Thus you have troubl'd us with your Observations about *Genders*, when we have no such Thing in the *English* Tongue, even by your own Confession.

Tir'd with this long Journey through such bad Way, I shall defer what I have else to say about the Absurdities of your Method and Performance, till I see whether you are satisfy'd with this I now send you: If I find by your Answer that you are not, I promise to show, out of almost every Page, such Blunders, that a School-Boy should be whipt for.

You may object indeed, that your *Antagonist* is guilty of some of the Faults which I only lay to your Charge. I do allow that he is faulty, but not so frequently and

H

grossly.

grofly as you, dear *Scindapsus*. He is fo clear in his Method, he keeps to his *Divifions*, which are *juft*; and as he has been guilty of fome Errors, fo he has taken the Means of being deliver'd from them, by giving interleav'd Copies to Men of Learning and Candor, both *Divines* and others, to make their Remarks, and improve what was done; but I do not find it at all the Temper of the *Bliſtri*, either to doubt their Abilities, or be capable of Correction: For tho' you found ſuch irrefragable Arguments in his Notes for many Things, and had the Advantage of having his Work before you the beſt Part of a Year, you have notwithstanding choſen to perſiſt in your own erroneous Opinion, tho' founded on no Manner of Reason, or for which at leaſt you have not vouchsaf'd to afford us any one. But Men of your Profession, if they are not qualify'd by ſuch admirable Accompliſhments, as the Author of the *Royal Grammar*, Dr. *Knipe*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Monford*, Mr. *Johnson*, and ſome others, are not very capable of Conviction, and recede from theſe firſt Principles, how erroneous ſoever, with the utmoſt Reluctance: And being us'd to dictate to their Learners without Controul, contract ſuch a *Self-Sufficiency*, that you think they may do ſo to the World too, without having Reason requir'd for what you advance.

I know you will be apt to ask me here, what I have to do with the Controverſy? What are either you or your Antagoniſt to me? Have I any Intereſt in either? I anſwer, honeſt *Scrutator*, in the Negative; I have no Manner of *Intereſt* to draw me into this Squabble with thee, but only of natural Love which I have of expoſing Pretenders: Beſides, how do you know, but that I my ſelf deſign to write another *Engliſh Grammar*, (ſince they are now in Mode) and I know no better Way of beſpeaking the Expectation of the Town, than by expoſing the Defects of thoſe who have gone before me? As for what has byaſ'd me more to your *Antagoniſt*, than to you, is, firſt, becauſe his Performance, tho' firſt, is infinitely the more perfect; and next, his generous Deſign of making a compleat Courſe of *Engliſh Education*,

on, of which the *Grammar* is only the Foundation. And to tell the Truth, honest *Scindapsus*, this last Thing has provok'd me to examine, and expose thy Blunders, lest those who want to improve this, should be misled by the Title, and so lay a rotten Foundation to so valuable a Structure, or rather lay no Foundation at all; but being puzzl'd, and uninstructed by yours, throw aside all manner of *Grammar* of our own native Tongue. Whereas the Other, withall its Errors, has a Method easy and plain, and merits what the *Censor* said of it. The most Ignorant may learn from the Text, and the most Learned may be entertain'd with the Notes; in which I found he had not only made a good Progress in the *Particular Grammar* of *English*; but had gon to the very Bottom of the *Philosophical* or *General Grammar* by the help of Mr. *Arnaud*, and the *Messieurs* of *Port Royal*, as he tells us in his Preface; and which I find in the Performance. I further found by the spreading many of his *Grammars* interleav'd into the Hands of the *Polite* and *Learned*; that there was a *sincere Aim* at bringing this to Perfection. This provok'd my Curiosity to examine into the Matter, and to see the Person who had with such Zeal undertaken this Task; and therefore, not being willing to be known, I went in a Disguise with a Friend to Mr. *Brightland's* House, ask'd him many Questions about his *Book*, the Reasons of his *Undertaking*, and the like: By all which I found, that he had been several Years soliciting the Men of Letters of his Acquaintance, to put this into Execution, and had procur'd several Essays in Manuscript to this End, which was a *Grammar* truly *English*, and purely on the *English* Tongue, without Regard to any other: That having, as he thought, at last in some Measure attain'd what he aim'd at, he had put it to the Press, and publish'd it to the World, under the Name of *A Grammar of the English Tongue, with Notes, &c.*

This mov'd my Curiosity to enquire a little farther about the Advertisement of one *Greenwood*, about another of the same Kind; and this occasion'd a History of all that pass'd between them on this Point, viz. That he propos'd you not only a Reward for any Discoveries you could

could furnish to his Design ; but that your Name should be mention'd, either as a Contributor or Coadjutor : But you, dear *Scraulum*, rejected all, full of your dear self, resolv'd to appear entirely by your self; and as you disdain'd sharing any other Man's Glory and Reputation, so you secur'd every one from any Share in your Infamy ; and so about a Year after it was first advertis'd, out comes your *Grammar*, after you had prepar'd its Way with Boasts of its Perfection, and of its future Victory over your *Antagonist*.

I did not know but I might find some Improvements in a Thing of this Nature, especially when there was one Essay on the Subject, which had made so good a Progress in it ; for, *Facile est inventis addere*. For this Reason I made my Bookseller get the first, that could be procur'd, and to perusing I went, full of mighty Expectations ; and was vex'd at so monstrous a Disappointment, *Parturient Montes*, the Mountain groan'd, and brought forth a little Mouse ; a true Quack's Method, a Bill promising all Things, while his Medicines perform nothing.

This Disappointment provok'd me to send you this Letter, since I found you design'd to visit the World with several other Books, hoping that by showing how unfit thou art to write any Book at all, thou might'st, if it were possible, come to know thy self, and learn Modesty ; and so, dear *Scindapsus*, *Blictri*, *Lirum*, *Larum*, *Screlum*, *Scraulum*, in *Aeternum valeto*, heartily farewell. Have a Care of this *Scribendi Cacoethes*, this ITCH of *Scribbling*, with which I find thou art infected : Mind thy *Scholars*, and deal *viva voce*, in *Gerunds* and *Supines*, to the End of the Chapter ; but never stain Paper more, 'till thou art Master of the *Art* or Subject thou do'st pretend to write upon. So *lierum*, *lierumq; valeto*.

POSTSCRIPT.



POSTSCRIPT.

THIS foregoing Discourse was written and printed off some Months ago, but had been suppress'd entirely; had not fresh Provocations made me think I should injure the Public by suffering an Inundation of new *Grammars*, without any Improvement: For since that, on which I have made those Remarks, another, much worse, and far less worthy of the Name of an *English Grammar*, by one *Adair*, has visited the Town; and I have been inform'd, that there is scarce a Pedagogue in Town, but is making an Essay that way; but without once deviating into the Right, or indeed without having the least View of the public Good, in bringing the Language of their Country to as sure and easy a Standard as possibly the Nature of the Thing will bear. But before I go to this second *Essay*, I have one Word or two to add to the first. I seem to have laid a Stress on his throwing out his eight Parts of Speech from every Member of his Division of Grammar. But on seeing the second Edition of *Brightland's Grammar*, I find the Author of that has taken Notice of the same Blunder, but in another Manner, allowing him a Sense of Etymology, under which he might have shelter'd his Nouns, Pronouns, and the rest; if he had not himself either rashly or ignorantly depriv'd himself of that Refuge, by making Use of the Word in the only Title of his Division in the Sense of Derivation, which he confesses the most obvious and general. Now, I must needs say, I think his Antagonist has made too large a Concession, for
I
whatever

whatever old Grammarian has made Use of Etymology in that peculiar Sense, a Person who is reforming Grammar, to make it more easy and obvious to the Learner, and for fixing the Grammar of his Mother-Tongue, should not have follow'd any Particulars, but made his Division in Words whose Sense is not doubted, obscure, or disputable, but clear and determin'd. Nature has made an easy, plain, and obvious Distinction, which is that of Letters, Syllables, Words, and Sentences. But, say you, this is a new Division; this is not *Lilly's*, nor that of the famous Grammarians of our Acquaintance. So much the better, say I, for if it be founded on Reason, be clear, plain, and easy, of what Consequence is Authority, or old Usage against it? All Language is built on these familiar Words, and is resolvable into them; and he that seeks Improvement, and the bare and naked Truth, without Affectation of a vain and useless Learning, will laugh at this silly Ambition of Pedants, and believe it more worthy a Man to hearken to Reason, than Authority.

So much for *Scindapsus*, which yet his Rival in Black may likewise consider to whom now we advance. I need not take Notice of the Misnomer, *Brighland's* Preface has done it; it is obvious as Evidence can make it. Well, what's here? *Apophthegms*, *Dialysis*, *Analogy*, *Asymoly*, *Heterostolichy*, *Heterology*, *Heterocleisy*, *Heterotary*, *Nationalis*, *Paronymichy*, *Diminutives*, *Collectives*, *Partitives*, *Intensives*, *Cardinals*, *Ordinals*, *Prepositive*, *Postpositive*, *Sapientia*, *Elenchus*! Sure this Author would put conjure us with his strange Terms, into Admiration of his Performance. Admirable English this! 'Tis a sure Way indeed to make the Study of Greek and Latin necessary to the Understanding of English! A most worthy Author of the *English Grammar*! We have indeed a Story of a Person that lov'd the Sound of Greek, tho' he did not understand it; but why he should think that he should recommend himself to the general Reader, because he was not easily understood, is as unaccountable as his ridiculous Affectation of so absurd a Singularity, as always to write the Pronoun

I like the small Vowel *i*; as if Distinction and Clearness were Vices of Speech, not Virtues. Other Authors in the Didactics, pretend to Perspicuity, but sure this is the first (except the Adepti) that ever profess'd Difficulty or Obscurity. *Avoid the Man that's singular,* (says Otway) *his Brain's unsound, his Sleep over-weighs his Wit.* This Author indeed has too many Symptoms of this throughout his Book; but they are too numerous, to leave Room for a through Disquisition, and therefore I shall only set my loose Remarks on some Particulars.

I would fain know of him what signifies the multiplying of *Grammars*, we having enow already in the *English* Tongue, unless Endeavours were us'd to improve them, and render our Language, and the regular learning it, more easy and familiar, as well as certain. *Ben. Jonson*, and long after *Mr. Lane*, have given us Performances more just, and less difficult, as being less imbrued with *Greek* Terms, and which will therefore bring us to a more speedy Knowledge of the Art they pretend to teach; And yet *Lane* himself is so embarras'd with *Latin* Terms, that I have known him thrown aside, as not intelligible to a Person unskill'd in *Latin* and *Greek*. But as if these Authors had been too sparing in this Particular, *THE English Grammar* has more than doubled their Number, without adding one Advantage to ballance the Difficulty. But indeed he seems too much a Pedagogue, to think so finely of Things, as to deliver them with a Gentleman's Address, or to give Light into Obscurity. For, to illustrate his Rudiments of Grammar, he appeals to the *Asthematics*, *Latin*, *Hebrew*, and *Greek*. Men of common Sense, think that the making an Art easy, is of most Consequence, and that it ought to be the chief Aim of the Study of the Instructor, to make it so. But this mysterious Author seems to be too far above common Sense, to have any Thought of that Matter, but industriously multiplies hard Terms and hard Rules, to as little Purpose as Heart can wish.

But he says in his Preface, that the learned Languages ought to be learned for the understanding Technical Words, &c. Whereas, if that were a sufficient Ground for imploying seven or eight Years of our Lives, there is as strong a Reason for our studying *French*, to understand the Terms of War and Cookery. But if indeed all the Languages must be study'd from which *English* is compos'd, or of which it borrows a more numerous Train than the Technical Words, we must not only have Skill in the ancient and modern Tongues of Note, but also in these less common and known of the *Gothic*, *old Saxon*, &c. as has been observ'd by the Authors of *Brighilant's Grammar*. A learned Author produces 600 radical *Greek* Words, deriv'd from the *Celtic*; yet, it would be merry enough to imagin, that the *Greeks* were ignorant of their own Language, or knew not the Meaning of those radical Words, because they were unacquainted with the *Celtic*, or the ancient *Gaulish* Language. But these are indeed the foolish Day-Dreams of dull Pedants, who can amuse themselves with poring on the Derivation of Words, while they neglect more useful Enquiries. Whereas, the Meaning of Words is to be taken from the Usage of the present Time, not that of former Ages. He himself (p. 212.) tells us, that the Use of Words alters in every Age; and Instances in the Word *Knave*, and some others. What then is *Etymology*, but a vain and crabbed Curiosity, of no manner of Consequence, and little or no real Use. Now, whether these radical *Gaulish* Words in the *Greek*, and a greater Number in the *Latin*, be as *Monsieur Pezron*, D. D. contends, really deriv'd from the *Celtic*, or these *Celtic* Words from the *Greek* and the *Latin*, it makes the same for my Point, that this Knowledge (if it may be call'd so) is too uncertain and precarious to be of any Use to the present Meaning of Words in any Language. But not to dwell on any one Absurdity in this Author, we might reasonably ask him, to what Purpose is the History of the eight Parts of Speech? as well as the ridiculous Remark of two Parts only? since in the Nature of Language,

in their Relation to Things, there are but four distinct Parts of Speech, and those must always have been in every Tongue. We have nothing at all to do to embarrass our selves with the foolish Words of the old *Grammarians*, which were never yet decided, and 'tis of no manner of Consequence whether they ever will be or not. The Business of an *English* Grammar, is, beyond Dispute, to make all Things as easy as can be to an *English* Reader or Learner of the meanest Capacity; whereas, this Author endeavours to set all Things as much out of the Way of common Understanding as possibly he can. But great is *Diana* of the *Ephesians*, *Pedantry* must be preserv'd, 'tis a Trade, and has many Members, and they must be fed; and to make the learned Languages unnecessary to all Men, Women, and Children, is, to rob them of so many Pensioners, who pay them for Words half, tho' tediously, learned. I wonder that a Person who shew'd so much Diffidence in himself, as to borrow so much of his Preface from Mr. *Lock* and *Drury*, should so little regard their Reasons against obliging every one to travel thro' unknown Countries, to know his own, whereas a Man ought first to be thoroughly acquainted with his own, before he goes into any other. The same will hold of Languages. The *Greeks* and *Romans* learnt all Arts and Sciences in their own Tongue, and Learning will never spread till it be so in *England*. *Simon* the Leather-Dresser in *Athens*, was a Hearer of *Socrates*, and had an Intimacy with *Xenophon*, *Plato*, *Socrates*, and all the Philosophers of that Time, who were Lovers of Truth. He learning *Philosophy* in his own Tongue, made a Figure among the wisest and most knowing, notwithstanding his Trade. *Sir George Estheridge* understood the *English* in Use so well, that the Correctness of his Style is recommended by so good a Judge as *Dryden*, for an Example of Purity; and yet he was so ignorant of the learned Languages, and the Etymology of our Tongue, that he has been reproach'd with it by the Lampoons of those Times. Now, I am apt to believe, that he, and even *Mrs. Bohn*, who knew no Language but her own, knew

the *English* Tongue much better than the Author of this Grammar; for how profound soever his Skill in the learned Languages may be, 'tis plain that he is not very great in his own, from drawing all his Examples, nay, some of the Rules and Exemplifications, from the *Holy Scriptures*, not remembering that we are no more to learn Languages from them, than Astronomy; and it must be own'd, that the Translators had not any great Skill in our Tongue, or our Style. Nor was the Language of this Nation brought so near a Standard, and deliver'd from so many Barbarisms, as at present it is. The Distinctions of Words, and their Proprieties, were less known; and therefore the quoting the Authority of the Translators of the Bible, for the Diction of the *English*, is highly ridiculous. And whoever should use *which* for *who*, would be esteem'd by all Men of common Knowledge, guilty of *Solécism*, notwithstanding the Translation of *Our Father, which art, &c.* The Gate open'd to 'em on his own Accord, &c. will not be satisf'd by his Equivocation of Gender, for we have no Gender in the *English*; nor will it make it true Grammar in *English*, tho' the *Greeks* join a Verb singular, to a plural Name; *There was taken up of Fragments, twelve Baskets, &c.* What a puzzling Bullie he makes, p. 61. about proving the *Verb* to signify *Motion*; but then not that Motion which all Mankind understand by the Word Motion, but I know not what sort of Motion, which is no Motion at all. And all this only out of Fondness of his old *Adumppimus*, and only indeed valu'd, because old. For the same Reason, this Author rejects the *JE* and the *Ve*, because there is nothing answering to it in the *Greek* Alphabet; tho' *Beta* is made by *Ciccard* and some others, *Vet*: Yet, one would suppose, that the *Hebrew* *J O D* should have pleaded in the Behalf of *Je*, especially since we have such a Modulation of Sound in our Tongue, which no other Letter can express. Out of this Love to old Ways, he likewise is not satisfy'd to decline our Words (though in Reality, we have no Declension) as other Gramma-

rians

mans have done; but, p. 53, declines our Adverbs too; which in the Latin, are indeclinable.

But to leap over most of his indigested Book, p. 226 presents me something that stops my Eye, and indeed it would surprize one, (if any Thing could surprize from this extraordinary Author) to find so learned a Person, bred at the Feet of *Gemastus*, nay, and a Teacher too, to talk of *accent*, quite from the Sense of the Word, as if it signify'd *Quantity*, not *Time*. Whereas, he might certainly have known, if he does not, that *Accent* relates to the raising or lowering the Voice, and not to the Length and Shortness of a Syllable. He tells us in one Place, that Accent is the due Timing or Pronunciation of some Syllable, more than the rest. But this being a little obscure, to make the Contradiction a little more visible, he explains himself by telling what the three Accents were, viz. the *Acute* or *Treble*, the *Grave* or *Bass*, the *Circumflex* or *Altean*: And yet he, immediately after this, loses himself in confounding the three Tones of Voice, with *Quantities*; and now, instead of having them *raised* *high* and *low*, obliges them to signify *long* and *short*.

But I find he will give us a Touch of his Skill in Poetry, as well as Grammar, and indeed with much the same Success. I would ask him, if it were not for disobliging so positive a Gentleman, what it signifies to say so much of Poetry, when all that he says can afford no manner of Information to the Reader or Learner, what that Art is; only general Notions which give no Instruction? To show his Taste exquisite, he quotes *Conley* for Numbers, who was too negligent in that Quality, and takes no Notice of *Waller* and *Dryden*, who brought them to Perfection.

I am afraid, indeed, that this Gentleman will be thought too much a Pedant in hurrying over the nobler Parts of Poetry, at the same Time that he enlarges on Epigram. His Origin of *Satyr*, p. 235, is extremely wrong; for what we call *Satyr*, is very different from the Satyrical Plays of the *Greeks*; those were Theatrical, and acted; but the *Roman Satyr* comes from

from *Satira Libra* and are only a short Essay in Verse on some Subject or Subjects; into which the Followers of *Bocchor* could never come as Actors, as is plain from those we have of *Horace* and *Juvenal*.

Thus likewise is he out entirely in his Account of Tragedy, since there is no Necessity of a miserable and bloody Event; very many of those of the *Greeks* which are extant, have a happy Conclusion; and *Aristotle* has left Rules for the writing of Tragedies, both of a happy and unhappy Event. He permits four Persons to speak in a Play, tho' *Horace*, and the Practice of the Ancients, say, and Reason likewise is against him. But indeed he that could refer a Man to *Scaliger* for Instruction in Poetry, must have a most despicable Taste in that polite Art.

To conclude, I must say of these two latter *Grammarians*, as a Master of Music did to two who apprais'd to him to decide who sung best: Truly said he to one, you sing the worst that ever I heard any one in my Life; and you (to the other) don't sing at all. *Scaliger* has given us the worst Grammar of the *English* Tongue that ever I saw, but *Elerologus* has given us no Grammar at all, I mean peculiar to our Language.